

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the Organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, July, and October; the REVIEW in the other eight months.

The Classical Review

EDITORS: W. H. D. ROUSE, Litt.D., Persé School House, Cambridge.

A. D. GODLEY, M.A., 27 Norham Road, Oxford.

Board of Management:

Prof. R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D., *Chairman.*

W. E. P. PANTIN, M.A., *Hon. Treasurer.*

E. HARRISON, M.A., *Hon. Secretary.*

Prof. GILBERT MURRAY,

Lit.D., D.Litt., F.B.A., F.R.S.L.

R. C. SEATON, M.A.

With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary, representing the Council of the Classical Association.

H. RICHARDS, M.A., *Representing the Oxford Philological Society.*

Prof. W. RIDGEWAY, D.Litt., Litt.D., Sc.D., LL.D., F.B.A., *Representing the Cambridge Philological Society.*

With the co-operation of Prof. WM. GARDNER HALE, University of Chicago; Principal W. PETERSON, LL.D., C.M.G., McGill University, Montreal; Prof. T. G. TUCKER, Litt.D., University of Melbourne; Prof. JOHN WILLIAMS WHITE, LL.D., Litt.D., Harvard University.

Vol. XXIX

MARCH, 1915

No. 2

CONTENTS

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS:

	PAGE
Notes on Aeschylus <i>Persae</i> . J. T. SHEP- PARD	33
Three Emendations in Theophrastus <i>His- toria Plantarum</i> . ARTHUR F. HORT ..	35
The Waterfowl Goddess Penelope and her Son Pan. A. SHEWAN	37
In Propertium <i>Retractationes Selectae</i> . J. S. PHILLIMORE	40
Note on Ovid, <i>Tristia</i> III. 6. 8 (Augustus et Iuppiter). W. WARDE FOWLER ..	46

NOTES:

ἀσκήσις Σελπιος in Eur. <i>I.A.</i> 7-8. J. E. HARRY	47
Greek Elegiacs. S. GASELEE	48
Notes on Vespa. R. T. C.	48

REVIEWS:

Clark, <i>The Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts</i> . JAMES HOPE MOULTON	49
Three Chicago Monographs: Stark, <i>The Christology in the Apostolic Fathers</i> ; Robi- son's <i>Syntax of the Participle in the Apostolic</i>	

REVIEWS (continued):

	PAGE
<i>Fathers</i> ; McIntosh, <i>A Study of Augustine's Versions of Genesis</i> . W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE	54
Magnus, <i>P. Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphoseon Libri XV</i> . D. A. SLATER	56

SHORT NOTICES:

Grenfell and Hunt's <i>Oxyrhynchus Papyri X</i> . S.	60
Laurand's <i>Manuel des Études Grecques et Latines</i> . R. B. APPLETON	61
Murray's <i>Euripides and his Age</i> . R. B. APPLETON	61
OBITUARY	62
NOTES AND NEWS	63
VERSION	64
BOOKS RECEIVED	64

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

BOSTON, MASS.: GINN & COMPANY, 29 BEACON STREET

Price for Single Numbers, 1s. net; U.S.A., 30 cents net. Yearly Subscription (Eight Numbers), 7s. 6d., Post Free. U.S.A., \$2.00 net.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual 'Proceedings' of the Association and of the Year's Work in Classical Studies (both post free). They may also obtain the CLASSICAL REVIEW and CLASSICAL QUARTERLY at the reduced price of 7s. and 9s. a year respectively (post free), provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public, viz. 7s. 6d. for the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 12s. 6d. for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY, or 18s. for the two Journals jointly, post free in each case.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Secretaries, Mr. W. H. Duke, Jesus College, Cambridge, and Professor Slater, Bedford College, London, N.W.; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Miss R. H. Rees, B.A., Ladybarn House, Withington, Manchester; Mr. R. W. Reynolds, King Edward's School, Birmingham; Mr. H. A. Ormerod, Grey Cottage, Blundell Road, Hightown, Liverpool; Mr. E. P. Barker, 426, Woodborough Road, Nottingham; Miss A. Woodward, Badminton House, Clifton, Bristol; Mr. O. R. A. Byrde, Royal Grammar School, Newcastle-on-Tyne; Mr. J. M. MacGregor, Bedford College, London, N.W.; Miss M. E. Pearson, University Registry, Cathays Park, Cardiff; Mr. P. W. Dodd, The University, Leeds; and the Rev. Father Ailinger, S.J., St. Xavier's College, Bombay.

STUDIES IN LITERATURE AND HISTORY.

By the late Right Hon. Sir ALFRED LYALL, P.C., G.C.I.E., K.C.B., D.C.L.

Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.

NOVELS OF ADVENTURES AND MANNERS—ENGLISH LETTER WRITING IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY—THACKERAY—THE ANGLO-INDIAN NOVELIST—HEROIC POETRY—THE WORKS OF LORD BYRON—THE ENGLISH UTILITARIANS—CHARACTERISTICS OF MR. SWINBURNE'S POETRY—FRONTIERS ANCIENT AND MODERN—L'EMPIRE LIBÉRAL—SIR SPENCER WALPOLE—RACE AND RELIGION—THE STATE IN ITS RELATION TO EASTERN AND WESTERN RELIGIONS.

THE ANCIENT & MEDIEVAL ARCHITECTURE OF INDIA: A Study of Indo-Aryan Civilisation.

By E. B. HAVELL,

Author of "Indian Sculpture and Painting," "Indian Architecture," etc.

With numerous Illustrations. Royal 8vo. 30s. net.

Mr. Havell's latest and most important work deals with fundamental questions relating to our Indian Empire which the war of nations against German militarism only makes more pressing. It is the first attempt of a European writer to use the materials afforded by the great architectural monuments of ancient and medieval India for a connected and concise study of Indo-Aryan history and polity from the Indian and Aryan point of view. It traces the origin of Indo-Aryan civilisation in the organisation of the ancient village communities, and throws much new light on the political, social, and religious ideals which were the leading motives of Indo-Aryan culture.

The attempt to demonstrate the entire fallacy of Fergusson's analysis of Indian architecture, the detailed information relating to the Indian science of town-planning and other practical questions, will certainly arouse much interest in architectural and archaeological circles; while the explanations of Indian symbolism and allegory, the descriptions and sumptuous illustrations of the classics of Indian architecture, sculpture, and painting, make it perhaps the most attractive of the author's works on Indian art.

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY

and
pon
onal
) to
eate

ual
5s.
gs'
ee).
the
the
t in
6d.
for

on.
ter,
rict
er;
rod,
26,
use,
on-
E.
The
ege,

Y.
L.

TH
RKS
E'S
OLE
RN

C-
n.

ian
irst
of
rom
isa-
ous

the
will
of
ian
on

The Classical Review

MARCH, 1915

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

NOTES ON AESCHYLUS *PERSAE*.

13. *πάσα γὰρ ἰσχὺς Ἀσιατογενὴς ὄχῳκε*
νέον δ' ἄνδρα βαύζει.

I hope to show that Paley was right in thinking that *θυμός* is the subject of *βαύζει*, though in other ways Paley missed the sense. The change of subject is the only difficulty, and I venture to think (1) that far more serious difficulties are involved if we try to make *ισχύς* the subject, and (2) that the composition of the whole poem and also the ideas suggested to Greek hearers by *βαύζει* make the connection with *θυμός* obvious for a Greek.

The best version among those which make *ισχύς* the subject is that of Mr. C. E. S. Headlam: 'All the strength of the Asian nation is gone abroad, and murmurs at having a new king.' This has the merit of recognising the significance of *νέον*. As Walter Headlam pointed out, Xerxes is doomed precisely because *νέος ἐὼν νέα φρονεῖ*, a theme which runs through the play. We should do better if we translated 'a new and young king.' Further, however, we shall improve on this version if we try to represent a little more closely the construction of the accusative. *ὑλακτεῖν τινα* can certainly mean 'to bark at somebody,' but *νέον ἄνδρα βαύζειν* (or *ὑλακτεῖν*) is different, cannot well mean 'to bark at someone as young.' The scholiast says *ἀσαφὶς λέγει*, and this shows the true construction. Just as *νέον τὸν ἄνδρα λέγω* means 'I call the

man young,' so, by the normal rules of lyrical heightening, *νέον τὸν ἄνδρα βαύζω* can mean 'I growl him young,' 'I call him, in a tone of harassed and suppressed indignation, young.' But there remains a difficulty not to be surmounted. Why does the chorus use this extraordinary *ἄνδρα* instead of *τὸν ἄνακτα*? If *ισχύς* is really the subject throughout this sentence, the most natural sense, or nonsense, is 'and grumbles at a young man,' or 'and growling calls a man, or a hero, young.' We need some reason of context which may save the sense by forcing us to interpret *ἄνδρα* as *the man par excellence*, Xerxes himself. Finally, after we have wrestled with the difficulty of the expression, we are left with a difficulty of thought. Why should Aeschylus make his chorus hint at disaffection in the army, a theme not later developed, and a theme not very suitable to a chorus whose general effect is to show us the excessive and dangerous reverence with which Xerxes is surrounded?

Now if we turn our attention to the scheme on which the first lines of the play are composed we shall find the clue. Symmetry is used at the outset to impress the ear with these themes which are to be woven into the fabric of the poem. First, we hear *οἰχομένων*, chosen instead of the colourless *βεβηκότων* of Phrynichus, in order to sound the first note of disaster heard so clearly in *ὄχῳκε* at l. 13. Then, in l. 3, the idea

of riches, already expressed to the understanding by *ἀφνεῶν*, is thrown at our imagination (some editors are ungrateful) in the opulent *πολυχρύσων*. Thirdly, the first mention of the hero is made in a royal phrase, dangerous as overweening, *αὐτὸς ἀναξ . . . Δαρείου-γενής*.

We have, then, first, the army gone, the gold, the king. Now see what follows: *ἀμφὶ δὲ νόστῳ τῷ βασιλείῳ καὶ πολυχρύσου στρατιᾷς*, my heart is stirred with anxiety, because the strength of Asia is gone . . . and . . . What do we expect? Is it not *αὐτός*, the king. Well, that is what *ἄνδρα* gives us. It means, not 'the hero,' nor 'the king,' but simply *αὐτός*. It is because it is so prepared that we can understand without needing an article. The regular sway of thought, army king, king army, army king, makes it safe also for the poet to change the subject of the sentence: we know that we are to hear the opinion, not of the army on the king, but of the chorus, anxious about both. Like courtiers, they speak with caution. As to the army, as a plain matter of tragic fact, 'it is gone': and as to the king, 'well . . . my boding heart mutters him firebrand.' The subject of *ὀρσοπολεῖται*, dropped for the moment, is resumed for this psychologically admirable *βαῦζει*.

The fine piece of characterisation depends for its success on the immediate apprehension of the audience that *θυμός* is the subject. That was made certain by the fact that the audience, unlike some editors, remembered Homer. *βαῦζει* to a Greek mind follows so naturally after words about an anxious, restless heart. A reference to *Od.* xx. 13 makes all plain. Read how Odysseus, angry, yet controlling his anger, felt his heart 'barking' like a bitch that has not yet recognised a man for friend or foe; not exactly barking, but rather rumbling within, as she wonders whether she shall bark or not, or even perhaps bite. Then read the comment of Plutarch, *Mor.* 506b. Then if you still think that *ἰσχύς* is the subject of *βαῦζει*, read aloud with what pleasure you can the poem which begins *τάδε μὲν Ἰερσῶν*, and see if you do not feel shaken in your conviction as you hear the words:

*οἰχομένων . . . πολυχρύσων . . . αὐτὸς ἀναξ Δαρείουγενής
νόστῳ βασιλείῳ . . . πολυχρύσου στρατιᾷς
ἰσχύς Ἀσιατογενής . . . ἄνδρα.*

Only by realising the effects obtained by this swaying movement in the first fifteen lines can we appreciate the splendid climax of ll. 59-65.

332. *τοῖωνδ' ἀρχόντων νῦν ὑπεμνήσθην
πέρη.*

*πολλῶν παρόντων <δ> ὀλίγ' ἀπα-
γέλλω κακά.*

Weil's *τοσόνδε* seems necessary for the conclusion of the messenger's speech. *ἀρχόντων* is generally recognised as a gloss and Weil, from Hesych. *Ταγοί . . . ἀρχοντες* read, as Hermann had suggested, *ταγῶν νῦν*. But *νῦν* appears in M only as a late correction, and is frigid. *Dion. Hal. R.A.* v. 74 *Θεσσαλοὶ ἀρχοὺς . . . καλοῦντες* (whereas the Thessalians really called them *ταγοὺς*) suggests that *ταγῶν* may really have been sometimes glossed by *ἀρχῶν*, which has indeed been conjectured here. I suspect that Aeschylus wrote *τοσόνδε ταγῶν τῶνδ' ὑπεμνήσθην πέρη*.

231. *ταῦτα δ' ὥς ἐφίεσαι
πάντα θήσομεν θεοῖσι τοῖς τ' ἐνερθε
γῆς φίλοις.*

This cannot mean, as Mr. C. E. S. Headlam puts it, 'All these things, as thou dost enjoin, will I perform for the gods. . . .' Notice the stress and the contrast with *κεῖνα*, which forbids this interpretation of *ταῦτα* even if you can bring yourself to suppose that *θήσω* can mean 'I will perform (a rite).' *ταῦτα* means 'these anxieties,' the troubles of the dream. What Atossa says is, 'As you bid me, I will put all these things that trouble me into the hands of the gods': *ἐκτελοῖτο δὲ τὰ χρηστά ταῦτα δ' . . .* But *θήσομεν θεοῖς* cannot bear this meaning either. Read *πάντ' ἐφήσομεν*, remembering Hesych. *Ἐφήμι . . . ἐπιτρέπω* and *Ἐφήσι ἐπιτρέπει*. Atossa entrusts her troubles to the gods, as the sailor his ship or his sails to the wind and sea (this a common use with or without the object; add to L and S this use from Symmachus *Ep.* 4, p. 160d, 'the helmsman *ἐπαφήσι τὴν ναῦν τῷ πελάγει*, and cf. Leonid. *Tarent.* 57, 6,

πάσαν ἐφείς ὁδόνην, Plutarch *Pyrrh.* xv.), as the orator who professes *περί παντός ἂν εἰπεῖν ἐφείς τῷ καιρῷ* Philostr. *V.S.* I, Proem., I. 24 II., or *τῇ γλώττῃ* II. to I., or as Heracles, trusting not to a single marriage . . . but *τῇ φύσει* *πολλὰς γενῶν ἀρχὰς καὶ καταβολὰς ἀπολιπεῖν ἐφείντος* Plutarch *Ant.* xxxvi. There is perhaps also a hint of the legal reference to a higher court (like the orator's *εἰς . . . ἐφίεναι*): for the dative in this connection cf. Lucian *I.* 9, *τέλος δ' ἐφίᾳσι μοι δικάζειν ὅποτέρᾳ βουλοίμην συνείναι αὐτῶν*, though there, as perhaps in *Trag. Fr. Adesp.* 474, *θεοῦ ἐφείντος* *τυχῇ*, the gloss should be *συγχωρῶν* rather than *ἐπιτρέπων*. The formula is Homeric: *ἀλλ' ἔχε σιγῇ μῦθον, ἐπιτρεψον δὲ θεοῖσιν* *Od.* xix., 502, and *νῦν μὲν παῦσαι τόξον, ἐπιτρέψαι δὲ θεοῖσιν* *Od.* xxi., 279. Add Xen. *Cyn.* vii. 5. 34 *τοὺς δὲ τεθνηκότας θάπτειν ἐφήκετοῖς προσήκουσιν*.

357-360. *μη σοι δοκοῦμεν τῇδε λειφθῆναι μάχῃ*;

ἀλλ' ὧδε δαίμων τις κατέφθειρε στρατόν, τάλαντα βρίσας οὐκ ἰσορρόφῃ τύχῃ. θεοὶ πόλιν σώζουσι Παλλάδος θεᾶς.

The accepted reading and punctuation is open to two objections: (1) *ἀλλ'* ὧδε is unnatural and indeed, in spite of ingenious defending, inexplicable. It might be tolerable as the first words of a reply by Atossa, 'Well but, if that is so . . .', but to assign the line to Atossa is to spoil the effect of the messenger's speech. (2) The first line cannot, as is

commonly supposed, mean, 'You surely cannot think our numbers were inferior.' This interpretation stresses *λειφθῆναι*, and anyone who is in the habit of reading aloud knows, if he attends to the natural order of words in Greek, that the stress must come on *τῇδε*. The line, as it stands, could only mean 'You don't surely think we were inferior' (in numbers, if you like) '*in this fight*.' The less you stress *τῇδε*, moreover, the more impossible it is to understand *λειφθῆναι* as 'we were worsted in respect of numbers,' the more you approximate to 'we were beaten in this fight.'

Now the scholiast, misunderstood by Hermann, was explaining *τῇδε* when he wrote '*ἐνταῦθα ἡγουν εἰς τὸ πλῆθος*,' and the ancient conjecture *δοκῶμεν* was right. Punctuate thus:

μή σοι δοκῶμεν τῇδε λειφθῆναι μάχῃ, ἀλλ' ὧδε δαίμων κ.τ.λ.

λειφθῆναι μάχῃ (with *μαχη* as little stressed as often are *χερί, δορί*), means 'we proved inferior in the fight,' and the sense is not obscure. 'Do not suppose it was this way (in numbers) that we proved inferior in the fight; no, 'twas in other wise. 'Twas a fell spirit destroyed us. . . . The gods themselves. . . .' Only thus do you preserve the natural stress of the first line, obtain full value from the mention of the *δαίμων*, and finally account for the asyndeton of *θεοί*.

J. T. SHEPPARD.

THREE EMENDATIONS IN THEOPHRASTUS *HISTORIA PLANTARUM*.

I. H. P. i. 13. 5. Description of the flower of the pomegranate:

Γίνεται δὲ καὶ τό γε τῆς ῥόας ἄνθος πολὺ καὶ πυκνὸν καὶ ὅλως ὁ ὄγκος πλατὺς ὥσπερ ὁ ῥόων· κάτωθεν δ' ἕτεροι δι' ὧν ὡς μικρὸν ὥσπερ ἐκτετραμμένους κύνινος ἔχων τὰ χεῖλη μυχώδη.

This is the reading of three of the four principal MSS., *U* (*Cod. Urbinas*), *M*. (*C. Medicus*), *V*. (*C. Vindobonensis*), except that for *κύνινος* they all give *κότινος*, an obvious blunder, for *ὧν U*

gives *φῶν* (erased), for *μυχώδη M* gives *μυκώδη*. The *editio princeps* (Ald.), which appears to represent an authority independent of the MSS. now extant, has *ἐκτετραμμένοι κότινος ἔχων τὰ ἄνω μυχώδη*. *P.* (*Cod. Parisiensis*) agrees with Ald., except that it has *ἐκτετραμμένος*. Gaza's Latin version (1483), which is sometimes valuable as being made from a MS. no longer extant, has '*Flos quoque punicae copiosus creberque est, denique amplitudinem sui quodam modo pomi aemulatur*.'

Parum se subtus attollens colligit et ambitu congruo sinuatim reddit,' which does not help much.

For *ῥόδων* Bodaeus conjectured *ῥόδων*, which is accepted by modern editors (Schneider, Wimmer), and seems necessary: Stackhouse however preferred *ῥοδῶν*, 'the rose-tree.' A similar corruption occurs in *H. P.* 3. 3. 5., where there can be no question that *Ῥόδω* is right. (So Gaza, while Ald. has *ῥόα*.)

Otherwise Wimmer, the latest editor (*Didot*, Paris, 1866), prints as above, remarking *Vitium haerere in verbis ἑτεροὶ δι' ὧν ὡς μικρὸν videtur*.

I conjecture for these words—*ἑτεροῖος, ὀϊος δῖωτος μικρὸς*, and translate the whole:

'The flower of the pomegranate is produced abundantly and is solid. In general appearance it is a substantial structure with a flat top, like the flower of the rose; but, as seen from below, the inferior part of the flower is different-looking, being like a little two-eared jar turned on one side and having its rim indented.'

The words *καὶ ὅλων—ῥόδων* describe the corolla as seen from above, the words *κάτωθεν—μυχῶδη* the undeveloped ovary, including the adherent calyx. This latter sentence explains incidentally why the pomegranate flower was called *κύτιος* (cf. *H. P.* 2. 6. 12. *C. P.* 1. 14. 4.; 2. 9. 3.; 2. 9. 9. *Diosc.* 1. 110. *Plin.* 23. 110.)—viz. because it resembled a *κύτος* (see *L. S. s.v.*). Theophrastus chooses the particular form of jar called *δίωτος* because the indentations between the sepals suggest this: this is called *ἐκτετραμμένος*, because the weight of the developing fruit causes it to take up at one stage a horizontal position, like a jar lying on its side: *χείλη* refers of course to the jar (for the plural cf. the use of *ἄντυγες*), *μυχῶδη* to the indentation in the calyx (a jar having presumably an unindented rim), *ἔχων* agrees with *δίωτος*. *δίωτος* does not seem to occur elsewhere as a substantive, but may well have existed: cf. Horace's *diota*: presumably *δίωτος* agrees with *ἀμφορεύς* understood, *diota* with *amphora*.

II. *H. P.* 2. 8. 3. After describing the process of 'caprification'—viz. the fer-

tilisation of the cultivated fig by the gall-insect which comes out of the wild fig—the author adds a sentence on 'pseudo-caprification,' which runs thus in *U*:

Φασὶ δὲ ἐρινάξῃ καὶ τὸ πόλιον καὶ ὅπταν αἰγίπυρος ἢ πολὺς καὶ τοὺς τῆς πτελέας κυπαίρους (apparently corrected to *κυπαίρους*).

The other MSS. omit *καὶ* before *ὅπταν*: for *κυπαίρους* *MV* read *κυπέρους*, Ald. *κύπεριν*.

For *αἰγίπυρος* Wimmer admirably conjectures *αὐτῷ καρπὸς*, after Gaza, who renders *cum copiose fructificat*. For the mysterious *κυπαίρους* or *κυπαίρους* he conjectures *κυττάρους*; but it is difficult to see how the word could be appropriate to the gall-bags of the elm leaf, which are doubtless what is here indicated. I suggest *κωρύκους* on this evidence: In *H. P.* 3. 14. 1. the elm is said to bear *κωρυκίδες* which contain gnat-like creatures; in *H. P.* 3. 15. 4. these growths are called *κωρυκώδη τινα κοῖλα*; in *H. P.* 3. 7. 3. the same thing is referred to as *τὸ θυλακῶδες τοῦτο*, where *τοῦτο* = 'the well-known': see also *H. P.* 9. 1. 2. where Schneider restores *κωρύκω* for *ἀγγεῖω*.

Translate: 'And they say that *πόλιον* also, when it fruits freely, and the gall-bags of the elm are used for caprification.'

Is it possible that *τοῦτο*, in the phrase *τὸ θυλακῶδες τοῦτο* quoted above, is deictic, and indicates that the lecturer (there seems good reason to think that the *Historia Plantarum* represents notes for or on lectures) held up a specimen? The usage is fairly common in this treatise—e.g., 3. 7. 3; 3. 18. 11; 4. 7. 1.

As to the possible occurrence of the word *θῶρυκος* in *H. P.* 9. 1. 2. it is interesting to see Pliny's version of the passage: the writer gives a list of trees which produce a gummy substance, ending with the elm, and adds *καὶ γὰρ αὕτη φέρει κομμὴ πλὴν οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ φλοιοῦ ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ ἀγγεῖω*. The last word Schneider ingeniously takes to be a gloss on *κωρύκω*: this is confirmed by Pliny's ludicrous mistranslation, which it also explains—*N. H.* 13. 11. § 67. (gum is found) *ulmo etiam in Coryco monte Ciliciae*. Pliny took *κωρύκω* to be a

proper name and added a geographical note! It appears that he had either this passage before him or *H. P.* 3. 14. 1. ἐν ταῖς κορυκίσι τὸ κομμί. The blunder was detected by Bodaeus, who however points out that there was actually a mountain in *Pamphylia* called Κώρυκος: and Sir William Thiselton-Dyer informs me that one wych-elm (*ulmus montana*), the species most afflicted with leaf-galls, does grow in the Cilician Mountains: so that a case for Pliny might be made out.

(The word κύτταρος, which Wimmer wishes to restore here, is mysterious. In *H. P.* 3. 3. 8. it is the name given to the male flower of the pine, and the text is confirmed by a scholium on *Av. Vesf.* 1111. Θεόφραστος κυρίως λέγει κύτταρον τὴν προάνθησιν τῆς πίτυος. But in what sense could this be called a 'cell'? In *H. P.* 4. 8. 7. the use is intelligible enough.)

III. *H. P.* 3. 18. 12. Description of σμίλαξ:

τὸν δὲ καρπὸν ἔχει προσημφερῇ τῷ στρύχνῳ καὶ τῷ μηλώθρῳ καὶ μάλιστα τῇ καλουμένῃ σταφυλῇ ἀγρία· κατακρέμαστοι δ' οἱ βότρυες κιττοῦ τρόπον· *παρθρυγκίζει* δὲ ὡς πρὸς τὴν σταφυλὴν· ἀπὸ γὰρ ἐνὸς σημείου οἱ μίσχοι οἱ ῥαγικοί.

παρθρυγκίζει is Wimmer's conjecture, but it seems impossible to supply, as he does, τὰ ἄνθη τὸν καυλόν, and he gives up ὡς πρὸς τὴν σταφυλὴν. In the MSS. the sentence runs thus:

Cod. Urbinas παρωγγύζει δὲ παρθρυγκίζει δὲ ὡς.

Codd. Medicus and *Vindobonensis* παραγγίζει δὲ παρθρυγκίζει δὲ ὡς.

The Aldine edition has παρεγγύζει δὲ ὡς. Gaza's version is *verum ad labruscam propius accedunt*, whence Schneider conjectured παρεγγίζουσι δὲ μᾶλλον. It looks as though παρεγγίζει δὲ was right, and the gibberish which follows in the MSS. concealed some unusual noun, the subject of παρεγγίζει: ὡς perhaps conceals its termination -ος: the missing noun should mean 'setting' or 'arrangement' of the berries. Now just below we have ἴδιον δὲ τὸ τῶν βοτρυῶν, ὅτι ἐκ πλαγίων τε τὸν καυλὸν παρθρυγκίζουσιν καὶ κατ' ἄκρον ὁ μέγιστος βότρυς τοῦ καυλοῦ ('a peculiarity of the clusters is that they make a row along the sides of the stalk, and the largest cluster is at the end of the stalk'), where παρθρυγκίζουσιν is Schneider's certain restoration for παρθρυγκίζουσαν, παρθρυγκίζουσι of MSS. (παρθρυγκίζουσι Ald.).

I suggest, then, παρεγγίζει δὲ ὁ παρθρυγκισμὸς πρὸς τὴν σταφυλὴν.

'The fruit is like that of nightshade and bryony, and most of all like the berry which is called the "wild grape." The clusters hang down as in the ivy, but the regular setting of the berries resembles the grape-cluster more closely: for the stalklets which bear the berries start from a single point.'

ARTHUR F. HORT.

Harrow.

THE WATERFOWL GODDESS PENELOPE AND HER SON PAN.

WE have recently been told that German results are accepted too readily. That is notoriously true of the Greek epic, and it has come nigh to be the undoing of Homer. It may well be applied to the work of the 'Saga-displacement' school in Germany, whose *métier* it was to make plausible, if startling, cases by stringing together a number of weakly indications in history, saga or story, and then saying Q.E.D. without a proper scrutiny of the credentials of the

authorities or the quality of the evidence adduced. Thus it was, for example, that the Trojan War became a struggle on Greek soil and Hector a Boeotian. Otto Crusius invalidated these speculations to some purpose, Andrew Lang and others helped, and they passed out of fashion. But they have proved useful in this country for the traditional-book theory of the epic. Several instances are embedded in Professor Murray's *R.G.E.*, and Mr. Thomson inclines to the same style of

demonstration in his companion volume. As an example, the evidence on which he concludes that Penelopé was a waterfowl goddess of Mantinea is briefly examined below. The copious literature will be found quoted in Pauly-Wissowa, Roscher, and Gruppe.

First, at Mantinea, where there were a number of graves of heroes and heroines, one mound was pointed out to Pausanias as Penelopé's. She had come to Mantinea, by way of Sparta, when turned out of house and home by Odysseus as a bad lot. Pausanias does not appear to think much of this story, for he notes a conflict with the *Thesprōtis*, and immediately afterwards disbelieves a similar tale of the Mantineans about Maera. To Mr. Thomson it is a 'memory of Penelopé as an ancient goddess of the land.' But this village talk really negatives divinity. *Non vera patet dea*; surely the character given Penelopé is enough. And then the mound. Some gods did shuffle off their immortal coils, generally for a time only, but I have not been able so far to find a case of a deity being laid to permanent rest like a mere mortal in an *ἀνδρόκμητος* tumulus. Pausanias, I think, mentions no such case, and he does not say there was worship or sacrifice at Penelopé's mound. Eugammon's story that Circe made her immortal is also against her divine origin.

But 'divine Penelopé must be' because she was the mother of Pan. Is that necessarily so? Semelé and Leda were not, I think, divine, to Greek story at least, whatever they may be now to scientific anthropomythologists. And was she mother of Pan? According to some accounts a Penelopé was, but sometimes she is a Nymph of that name, and Pan is *νυμφαγενής*. Other versions gave other mothers. Mr. Thomson's statement of the case is inadequate and not unbiassed. He chiefly relies on a parenthetical remark of Herodotus (one of those *λεγόμενα* which the historian says he is bound to report, *πείθεσθαι γὰρ μὲν οὐ παντάπασιν*), and the authorities who favour the view Mr. Thomson does not like are said not to 'count.' He even sets aside the Hymn to Pan

because it is bound to follow 'Homer.' But what then? It is the rule for the Hymns to follow 'Homer.' Most people will think, I feel sure, that the Hymn would be the very best evidence in a paternity proceeding. Some of the witnesses, none apparently earlier than Pindar (as reported by Servius; but a different account is also attributed to the poet), do seem to mean our Penelopé, but there are a number of other claimants, and Pan's variety of parentage deserves a paper to itself.

Again, Odysseus himself had a connection with Mantinea, and it was there, it is suggested, that he 'met' the waterfowl goddess and married her. The Mantinean connection is argued from the fact that he came there, an oar on his shoulder, to find, by order of Teiresias, people who did not know the sea and ate food without salt. When he found them, he was to sacrifice to Poseidon. This oracle, Mr. Thomson says confidently, 'conceals some historical fact,' to wit, 'the foundation of a cult of Poseidon in some inland place remote from the sea,' but he cannot really know this. Mantinea is selected as the place in question on the authority of a paper by Svoronos, which is, on the whole, a careful statement of the evidence. He and Mr. Thomson reject the belief of the ancients that Epirus was meant, partly on Eustathius' *vetus jocus* about the *βαρβαρόφωνοι δοῦποι* of the names of the towns mentioned, and partly because Epirus had a seaboard.¹ But these are small matters compared with the insuperable difficulty attaching to Mantinea. It is not reasonable to ask us to believe that Odysseus tramped through Elis and over nearly the whole breadth of Arcadia, leaving its secluded central mountains severely alone, and did not find what he sought till he came to its eastern border, at a place only twenty miles from the sea (which must be visible from its hills in the atmosphere of S. Greece nearly every day of the year), and with two tracks to the Gulf at Argos. The Mantineans may, like

¹ There is much to be said for it. But would any place in Greece suit? Libya's claims have been urged. Kretschmer is satisfied with Epirus.

the Arcadians generally, have had no concern with *θαλάσσια ἔργα*, as Mr. Thomson quotes from the *Catalogue*, but that they did not know the sea and did not use its salt is quite incredible.

Yet again, Didymus and scholiasts preserve as names once borne by Penelopé, Ameiraké (Amirakis, Amerakis), Arnakia (Anarkia), Arnea and Arnaia. The two last and, somewhat rashly, the second, Mr. Thomson thinks *may* mean 'she of Arné,' and this Arné *may* be a spring of that name near Mantinea, unknown to fame save for one story. The possibility is held to confirm Mantinean connection, and to suggest that Penelopé was a waterfowl goddess, though there is nothing in the notices that points to a spring or to Penelopé's divinity. But I find that three ladies among her earthly ancestors bore the name of Arné (sometimes spelt Arené), that there was a man Arnaïos in Ithaca, and that there was an Arnaïos or Arneios in the family into which Penelopé's uncle Tyndareos married. As to the origin of these names, no one seems to have discussed it till now,¹ a derivation of Arnea from *ἀρνέισθαι*, though supported by an oracle, being evidently folk-etymology. There may be a connection with *ἄρνα*, *oppidum* or *arx*, which is thought to be prehellénic. That with the spring Arné is a mere possibility till Penelopé's relation to it is established or inferable *aliunde*.

Various explanations of her name have been given, but none better than those based on the famous Web. She, like the homonymous Nymph, is *Weberin*. Fick formerly derived it from the bird *πηνέλοψ*, but changed to the interpretation *Gewebe auflösend*. Solmsen has recently returned to the bird, and Mr. Thomson approves. There was a story that Penelopé was once rescued by *πηνέλοπες* when flung into the sea, and this 'proves that the Greeks'—some of them—'connected Πηνελόπη with πηνέλοψ.' Her rescue from the sea by *marsh* birds described of old as 'like a duck, but the size of a pigeon' is not merely 'a quaint myth'; it is a story so absurd that

folk-etymology is suggested at once. Mr. Thomson finds support in the fact that Penelopé is sometimes represented in art with a *pēnelops* beside her. If the *pēnelops* has been finally identified as a mallard or widgeon or some other species—Professor D'Arcy Thompson only gives 'a kind of Wild Duck or Goose'—and Mr. Thomson knows that the bird drawn by the vase-painters is of that species, there is no more to be said. But can he be sure on those points? Does not one of Penelopé's pet geese (*καὶ τέ σφιν λαίνομαι εἰσορώσα*, *Od.* xix. 537) suit equally well, as the dog Argos does for pictures of the Foot-washing?

The argument here breaks away to the analogy of the Stymphalian Artemis, who is also said to be a waterfowl *koré*, though her *Wesen*, like that of most other gods and heroes nowadays, takes many other forms. The analogy with Artemis is not new, but the statement is long and involved, and I am not concerned with it. The evidence that Penelopé was a Mantinean goddess is doubtful in every particular. The strength of a chain is the strength of its weakest link, and if every link is weak, the chain is weak indeed.

It is easy to see how the story that Penelopé died at Mantinea *may* have arisen. A connection with Pan once started, her expulsion by her husband and her removal to the seat of her own family in Lacedaemon, and thence to one of the principal places in Pan's Arcadia, would easily follow, and a mound for her burial-place also. But how did the relationship to Pan start in vulgar minds? May not that again be referable to folk-etymology?—of which, as of superior philology, one may say with the French savant, *que de sottises il nous faut avaler en ton nom!* Can anyone who has seen the form Πανελόπα doubt that this is a reasonable explanation? The folk *ἐφλύναν*, to use Tzetzes' word, with the lady's name as they did later with the god's.² Gruppe suggests that Πάν is a *Kurz-*

¹ I now see that Goerres suggests 'robber' for Ameiraké, comparing Athené Ἀἰρίς. He gives no authority, and we are not helped.

² He became the symbol of the universe, τὸ πᾶν. The Hymn makes him the all-gladdening. He owed his origin to *all* the Wooers. Possibly Panticapaeum, Panea and Pandosia owed their cults to their names.

form for Πανέλοπος (of which δασύπους, appropriate of Pan, might be a possible interpretation) through Πάνελος, a name that does occur. But that is doubtful, and an original Πάων, though it has the high sanction of Drs. Farnell and Roscher, and though the form is supported by an inscription, has not satisfied all. It is curious that the schol. and Eustath. on *Il.* xxiii. 762, by connecting Πάν with πηνίων, πανίον, brings us round again to Penelopé. Gruppe says these words may be from an original *πάν = *σπán, *Spinnhaar*. It looks as if the mythologists should pause, in regard to the Pan-Penelopé connection, till the philologists reconsider the names of the heroine and the god.

The monstrous regiment of folk-etymologists went very far. The shameless, lustful Wooers being ready to hand in the saga, or in the *märchen*

welded into it, first one and then another was dragged in, and finally there was that φαντεπίφανλον invention that Pan ἐκ πάντων (μνηστήρων) ἐσπάρη, *sicut ipsum nomen Pan videtur declarare* (Servius)—a startling contrast this to the Great Pan of later ages! He was, it may be observed, late in coming into his kingdom as a respectable god. In early days he was but a sprite of the Arcadian wilds, and ἐβαρβάρωτο χρόνιος ὢν ἐν Ἀρκάσιν. Things were said of him in his unregenerate character which make us wonder the less that a nasty explanation of his origin was accepted by some people. The Hymn shows a better way. But for all those who refuse to believe that Homer and Hesiod are late and Athenian and vamped up, there is no necessity for any special vouchers for the character of περίφρων Πηνελόπεια.

A. SHEWAN.

IN PROPERTIUM RETRACTATIONES SELECTAE.¹

I. iii. 35-6.

tandem te nostro referens iniuria lecto
alterius clausis expulit e foribus.

The first clue to the understanding of this is in IV. viii. 27:

cum fieret nostro toties iniuria lecto.

A conjugal infidelity is the 'outrage.' 'Has the other woman's outrage kicked you out?' is the gist of Cynthia's question.

But what does *te referens nostro lecto* mean? A dative of place whither? They say so. *Clamor caelo*, etc. Let them say. A small correction in that part of the verse, where the very rhythm betrays something amiss, will mend all. For *tandem* read *tene vicem*.

tene vicem nostro referens iniuria lecto
. . . expulit.

Has *her* outrage, *vicem referens nostro lecto* avenging my (outraged) bed
vicem referre = *ulcisci* is Ovidian.

at, puto, non poteras ipsa referre vicem?
Ars. i. 370.

¹ Continued from *Classical Review*, vol. xxviii., Nos. 1 and 3.

I wish *eadem referre* were attested in the same sense (as ταῦτ' εἰσφέρειν in Greek, e.g. Dem. *Mid.* 101), but I cannot find an instance. Palaeographically it would be easier than *vicem*; but an Irish *ic* is easily mis-read as a *d*. *Te*, I take it, was then interpolated to stop the gap of a syllable and to supply an object for *referens*.

There still remains the difficulty of *expulit ex clausis foribus*. Lachmann's *aspulit* seems the best correction.

I. x. 2.

O iucunda quies, primo cum testis amori
affueram vestris conscius in lacrimis!

Probably *thalamis*, as Huschke conjectured.

I. xiii. 21-24.

non sic Haemonio Salmonida mixtus Enipeo
Taenarius facili pressit amore deus,
nec sic caelestem flagrans amor Herculis Heben
sensit in Oetaeis gaudia prima iugis.

tantus . . . inter utrosque furor will suggest to anyone who is intimate with Propertian refinements that, of the two mythological testimonies adduced, one

will offer the male as grammatical subject of the sentence, the other the female. This antecedent probability that *Hebe* and not *Heben* should be read in 23 is confirmed by the harshness of *amor Herculis sensit gaudia* for *amans Hercules sensit gaudia*. This is usually defended by the alleged parallel of *quae miser error perpessus Hercules flevit* in I. xx. 15, 16, but the change of *error* into *erro* cures that passage (cf. *Classical Review*, vol. xxiv., p. 213, 1910). There is nothing harsh or strange about *amor Herculis Hebe sensit gaudia prima*—‘Hebe beloved of Hercules tasted her first joys.’ But what of *caelestem*? No epithet is to be expected: it unbalances the verse. What is required is a predicate or adverb to correspond with the *facili* of the other district. What Propertius finds so remarkable in the case is the unembarrassed readiness and entrain of the couple.

Read then:

nec sic confestim flagrans amor Herculis Hebe
sensit in Oetaeis gaudia prima iugis.

I. xvi. 5-12.

5 nunc ego nocturnis pоторum saucia rixis
6 pulsata indignis saepe queror manibus;
9 nec possum infamis dominae defendere noctes
10 nobilis obscenis tradita carminibus;
7 et mihi non desunt turpes pendere corollae
8 semper et exclusi signa iacere faces;
11 nec tamen illa suae revocatur parcere famae
12 turpior et saeculi vivere luxuria.

The transposition of 9-10 and 7-8 gives meaning to *nec tamen* (= *cum tamen non*), but the grave question remains: what to make of v. 12.

Lachmann took a short way, by bastardising the couplet; Baehrens read *purior et saeculi*; Rothstein justifies the text by one of the thousand thousand pieces of exegesis which have for their common unavowed major premiss that Latins breathed Baltic fog and not clear Mediterranean air for their climate. For *secli* Heinsius conjectured *segni*—surely an anticlimax after *infamis noctes*.

Let it be noted that—

1. A quadrisyllabic ending such as *luxuria* especially requires an attribute to balance it in the first hemistich.

2. *vivere* requires a word of verbal force to give it construction.

The second half of the verse is in no way suspect; it agrees with the type—

et non ignota vivere nequitia (II. v. 2).

The two wanting elements must, then, be conjecturally recovered out of *turpior et secli*. *turpior et*, I guess, should be <s> *tuprorum*.

The word *stupra* in such a context falls pat enough, e.g.—

nam nil *stupra* valet nihil tacere

in Catull. vi. 12 (generally accepted since Scaliger).

Vistilia praetoria familia genita licentiam *stupri*
apud aediles vulgaverat.

Tac. Ann. II. 85.

Palaeographically the change is not violent: an initial lost, and the *per compendium* symbol for *et* and *-um* confused. An attribute found for *luxuria*, it remains to find the verbal hinge of the construction. I had thought of *stuprorumque sedet vivere luxuria*, ‘She is determined to live,’ etc. But the context seems to disqualify the solemnity of the impersonal *sedet*. The adjective *facilis* fits the place better. It is a favourite with Propertius in the sense of easy morals.

Haemonio Salmonida mixtus Enipeo.

Taenarius *facili* pressit amore deus (I. xiii. 22).
seu *facili* totum ducit amore diem (I. xiv. 10).
quod si tam *facilis* spiraret Cynthia nobis
(II. xxiv. 5).

non ego tam *facilis* (II. xxix. 33).

For the added infinitive cf.—

facilis cedere lympa (I. xi. 12).

facilis spargi rosa (IV. viii. 40).

faciles aurem praebere puellae (II. xxi. 15).

Read then:

nec tamen illa suae revocatur parcere famae,
stuprorum *facilis* vivere luxuria.

‘And, all the time, nothing recalls her to a sense of decency: she takes so readily to the life of *splendeurs de courtisanes*.’

I. xvi. 38.

te non ulla meae laesit petulantia linguae,
quae solet irato dicere tota loco.

Accepting Beroaldus’ *tuta* for *tota*, perhaps one needs no heroic remedies for this passage. Just as Phaedrus in

Fab. I. xxviii. 7, tuta quippe ipso loco,
supports that reading, so another
phrase in Phaedrus supports *ignoto* for
irato. *Fab. xiv.:*

malus cum sutor inopia deperditus
medicinam *ignoto* facere coepisset loco.

Being a stranger, the lover can speak
without restraint.

quae solet ignoto dicere tuta loco.

II. iii. i.

qui nullum tibi dicebas iam posse nocere
haesisti : cecidit spiritus iste tuus.

That *nullum* should be in the MSS.,
and not *nilum* or *nullam* is surely a
very singular thing. *Nullam* and *nihi-*
lum (Heinsius and Scaliger) have usually
been adopted. But is not this verse
yet another case of the confusions
arising from the spelling *vocare* = *vacare*
(cf. II. xxvi. 54 and IV. ii. 19, where
vacans had passed into *vorans*¹)? Read

qui <p>aullum tibi dicebas iam posse *vocare*.
Cf.

liber eram et vacuo meditabar vivere lecto

in the preceding elegy.

Whether (and, if so, why) Propertius
wrote *qui paullum tibi dicebas*, and not
qui tibi dicebas paullum, is another ques-
tion.

II. ix. 13.

foedavitque comas et tanti corpus Achillis
maximaque in parva sustulit ossa manu
(Achilli O Achillis *cett.*)

Briseis did not pick up the dead
Achilles bodily: after cremation re-
mains no *corpus*, but bones and ashes.
The couplet has these two vices: the
intolerable repetition of Achilles' name
from v. 9, and the want of a word for
ashes. Read Lucan *Phars.* ix. 55-62
(it is Cornelia's regrets that she has
been denied the privilege of giving the
last rites to Pompey's body), and the
solution appears.

ergo indigna fui, dixit, Fortuna, marito
accendisse rogam, gelidosque effusa per artus
incubuisse vivo? Laceros exurere crines
membraque dispersi pelago componere Magni?

¹ By the way, Broukhuyzen mentions that
the Codex Borrichianus gives *vocabis* for *vacabis*
at II. xxxii. 7 = II. xxiii. 37 of his numbering.

volneribus cunctis largos infundere fletus?
ossibus et tepida vestes implere favilla,
quidquid ab extincto licuisset tollere busto,
in templis sparsura deum?

Ossa and *favilla* are what remain after
cremation.

The initial *f* of *favilla* became
attached as an *f* to the preceding word,
leaving what in such a context was
most likely to be read as a case of the
name *Achilles*. Of the remaining *corpu*,
I would make either *curva* or *incurva*.
She stoops with the burden of carrying
tanti favillam.

foedavitque comas et tanti curva favillam
maximaque in parva sustulit ossa manu.

The picturesque epithet would de-
scribe the stooping gesture of one who
carries a heavy weight (*sc.*, an urn) in
both hands. Such, I believe, is the
true interpretation of IV. vii. 25:

denique quis nostro *curvum* te funere vidit?

II. xxii. 39, 40.

aut si forte irata meo sit facta ministro
ut sciat esse aliam quae velit esse mea.

For *meo ministro* Baehrens conjectured
deo sinistro; but *meo ministro* is appro-
priate enough, and the Latinity shows
that the fault lies elsewhere. Why *sit*
facta irata? It is no more classical for
sit irata than *fio iratus* would be for
irascor.

Read

aut si forte irata meo *sint fata* ministro
ut sciat esse aliam, etc.

It is the slave who is described as
'having no luck' when his errand fails.
(The dialogue between Parmeno and
Gnatho in *Eunuchus* 275-290 illustrates
the position; or, still better, Bacchis'
threat to Syrus in *Hautontimorumenos*,
724-8.) And it is the slave who is to
know that, in the unlucky event of a re-
buff in the ordinary quarter, there is a
second string to his master's bow.

II. xxvi. 23, 4.

non si Cambysae redeant et flumina Croesi
dicat 'de nostro surge, poeta, toro.'

Cambyses was never proverbial for
riches, and his name has generally been
held for an interpolation in this line.
Guyet conjectured *Candaulae*; Bur-

mann, *iam Cyri* and subsequently *iam Gygae* (which has enjoyed the approval of Schrader and of Rothstein); Vahlen, *Cambletae*; Postgate and Housman, *gaza Midae*.

If another name was in the verse at all, it can hardly fail to have been either that of Gyges or that of Midas; but the *et* is awkwardly misplaced—not without precedent, but still awkwardly; and the palaeographical probability does not come very kindly to meet the logical, in support of *gaza Midae*.

Supposing Croesus alone to be cited as the typical millionaire prince, as he is cited alone in III. v. 17:

Lydus Dulichio non distat Croesus ab Iro,
and III. xviii. 28:

Croesum aut Pactoli quas parit umor opes,
another common noun to match *flumina* must be discovered under the letters *cambise*: *et* will thus be normal. Plainly the word must mean riches, treasures, or the like.

Now the authorities mostly mention Croesus' *θησαυροί*, treasury-vaults: e.g., Herodotus IV. 126, Pseudo-Plutarch *de Fluviis* VII. (ed. Didot, vol. v., p. 85). The Latin for *θησαυροί* is *favisae*, a word explained by Varro apud Aul. Gell. *Noctes Att.* II. 10, whose explanation reappears in Paulus *Exc. c. Festo* s.v. Propertius may have written

non si favisae redeant et flumina Croesi.

The conjecture postulates the confusion between *b* and *v* which I have already pointed out in III. vii. 45 (*viveret*: *biberet*) and IV. ii. 34 (*favor*: *fabor*): see *Classical Review*, vol. xxviii., pp. 11 and 81. Given that the copyist had *fabisæ* before him and *Croesus* in the context, it seems not unlikely that he would read it as *cābise* = *Cambyssae*. A rare and archaic word like *favisae* had little chance of surviving.

But I do not know that the *a* can be long if the *o* of *fovea* is short. The word is not cited from any verse.

III. vi. 37, 38.

et mea cum multis lacrimis mandata reporta:
'iram non fraudes esse in amore meo.'

Thus codd. et edd. vulgo, by the carelessness which allows one to read nonsense ninety-nine times over until, the hundredth time, it dawns. For the sense requires, and the rule of the metre prefers, that the possessive adjective shall be predicate to *iram* and *fraudes*. Cf. Terence, *Haut.* 782:

Sv. non ego dicebam in perpetuum ut illam illi dares,
verum ut similes. CH. non meast simulatio.

Read

iram, non fraudes, esse in amore meam.

The phrase *in amore*, which had the special charm of corresponding syllabically as well as in sense with Callimachus *ἐν ἔρωτι* (*Anth. Pal.* V. 53), recurs several dozen times in Books I.-III.: of these in only two is it apparently qualified by a possessive, viz.:

nunc in amore tuo cogor habere notam.
I. xviii. 8.

namque in amore suo semper sua maxima
cuique
nescioquo pacto verba nocere solent.
II. xxv. 31.

In the latter *suo* = *propitio*, a common enough idiom; in the former, if *tuo* be sound, it represents an objective genitive. But is it sound? There is a second converging reason for thinking *tuo* corrupt.

The phrase *habere notam* is very rare, but not doubtful in meaning: e.g. *et collo blandi dentis habere notam* — 'to have the mark,' *Ov. Am.* I. vii. 42.

It is also a medical term (like *notam exhibere*) for 'showing symptoms': as in Celsus III. ii. in longis quoque morbis etiam *tales notas non habentibus*. But without the defining *dentis* and *tales* each sentence would be meaningless. Phaedrus has 'a quo repulsus tristem sustinuit notam' (*Fab.* I. iii. 11). The phrase is never used of censorial reprobation; and even if (*per impossibile*) it were for *notatus sum infamia quod te amem*, that would give no antithesis to the hexameter.

Wanted: the genitive case of a word to indicate the opposite of *inter felices amantes numerari*.

The man 'whom no girl will look at' is a defined type in antiquity. Venus has

a grudge against him: he is ἀναφρόδιτος (cf. Arist. *Ran.* 1045). Pamphilus in Ter. *Andr.* 245 complains:

adeone hominem esse *invenustum* aut *infelicem* quemquam ut ego sum!

inamabilis and *illegidus* are so used in Plaut. *Bacch.* 615.

None of these gives a noun whose genitive is metrically possible to be attached to *notam* in our present problem; but there is yet another adjective to express the same idea of 'fatally lacking in charm'—*inamoenus*.

Suppose Propertius wrote—

qui modo felices inter numerabar amantes,
nunc *inamoenitiae* cogor habere notam,

he would have written a word which would readily enough be read as *in amore tuo* or *tuae*, but a word which alas our lexicons have failed to preserve. I hear Robinson Ellis's ghost murmur, 'More than hazardous.' . . .

The article on *amoenus* in the new Thesaurus shows how commonly the word was applied to persons in popular language, as evidenced by inscriptions. The noun is strictly formed on the analogy of *inimicitia*.

III. viii. 29, 30.

dulcior ignis erat Paridi cum grata per arma
Tyndaridi poterat gaudia ferre suae.

(I assume *grata* as a certainty, since *grata* makes nonsense: 'the battle of pleasure,' not 'the Greek battle,' is meant.)

ferre gaudia is a phrase never used by Catullus or Tibullus, once by Virgil with characteristic slyness of allusion:

'quo fugis, Aenea? thalamos ne desere pactos;
hac dabitur dextra tellus quaesita per undas.'

talìa vociferans sequitur strictumque coruscant
mucronem, nec *ferre* videt sua *gaudia* ventos.
Aen. X. 649-652.

and by Propertius here only. His

quanta ego praeterita *collegi gaudia* nocte
(II. xiv. 9),

is a little different.

But there are at least seven instances of it in Ovid which all agree in one meaning, viz. to take pleasure not to give pleasure.

They are as follows:

- (1) hac fruar: haec de te gaudia sola feram.
Her. xii. 22.
- (2) sperando certe gaudia magna feram.
Am. II. ix. 44.
- (3) protinus ex facili gaudia ferre licet.
Rem. 522.
- (4) hoc et in abducta Briseide flebat Achilles,
illam Plisthenio gaudia ferre licet.
Rem. 778.
- (5) gaudia quanta tuli! quam me manifesta
libido
contigit! ut iacui totis resoluta medullis!
Metam. ix. 483.
- (6) quantaque vis avido gaudia corde feras.
Trist. III. xi. 58.
- (7) quaeque est in vobis pietas alterna feretis
gaudia, tu fratris fascibus, ille tuis.
Ex Ponto IV. ix. 62.

In *Her.* xviii. 43 for

gaudia rapturo si quis tibi claudere vellet
aerios aditus,

Heinsius read

gaudia laturo.

If *gaudia ferre* is a set phrase for to take pleasure it can evidently never be constructed with a dative, and we must beware (as not all commentators have been) of taking *Plisthenio toro* in (4) and *fascibus* in (7) for anything but ablatives. The person of whom the pleasure is taken, can be expressed (where necessary to be expressed at all) by an ablative, as in (7); by *de*, as in (1); by *ex*, as in (3).

Though Ovid furnishes no example of a genitive, yet, since *ferre* = φέρειν, a genitive is as logical and natural with *gaudia ferre* as with *spolium* or *spolia ferre* which = *spolia capere* just as it = *gaudia capere*. Cf. Val. Flacc. IV. 164:

Hesionam et Phrygiae peteret cum gaudia
nuptae.

Read therefore

Tyndaridis poterat gaudia ferre suae
as Burmann records the codex Regius
alter (Parisinus) read.

III. x. 27.

sit sors et nobis talorum interprete iactu
quem gravibus pennis verberet ille puer.

Four hundred and twenty-seven years ago Beroaldus remarked that *gravius* was the right reading; but the habits of

scholarship are very like the habits of the scriptural sow, and Beroaldus' certain emendation has been merely recorded as a curiosity by Burmann and Baehrens. Strange that a poet whose text has received the attentions of such Latinists as Heinsius, Broukhuyzen, and Lachmann should still present such a blemish. But Broukhuyzen was content to observe that the phrase was a metaphor from cockfighting, and leave it at that. And Lachmann's therapeutic rays flashed fitfully.

Everybody knows that in Latin elegiacs (except as written by school-boys), as a rule, noun and epithet stand on opposite sides of the pentameter caesura; yet one may hardly appreciate how infinitesimal are the exceptions to this rule in Propertius, unless by taking a census. I believe the following is a complete list. (Pronouns are of course a different category, and so are adjectives when constructed as predicate. I am merely concerned with the poet's practice where the adjective is decorative but not significant.)

- (1) nudus Amor formae non amat artificem (I. ii. 8).
- (2) sanguinis et cari vincula rupit amor (I. xv. 16).
- (3) montibus Etruscis, haec sciat esse mea (I. xxi. 10).
- (4) Caesare sub magno cura secunda fores (II. i. 26).
- (5) Gorgonis anguiferae pectus operta comis (II. ii. 8).
- (6) pauperibus sacris vilia tura damus (II. x. 24).
- (7) et levibus curis magna perire bona (II. xii. 4).
- (8) auribus et puris scripta probasse mea (II. xiii. 12).
- (9) maxima praeda tibi maxima cura mihi (II. xvi. 2).
- (10) fallaci dominae me pudet esse iocum (II. xxiv. 16).
- (11) candida Nesae caerulea Cymothoe (II. xxvi. 16).
- (12) votivas noctes et mihi solvem decem (II. xxviii. 61).
- (Postgate's punctuation eliminates this instance.)
- (13) communis culpa cur reus unus agor? (II. xxx. 32).
- (14) Silenique senes et pater ipse chori (II. xxxii. 38).

- (15) agricolae domini carpere delicias (II. xxxiv. 74).
- (16) nec Iovis Elei caelum imitata domus (III. ii. 20).
- (17) carminis heroi tangere iussit opus (III. iii. 16).
- (18) octipedis Cancrī terga sinistra time (IV. i. 150).
- (19) concordique toro pessima semper avis (IV. v. 6).
- (20) litibus alternis quos putet esse datos (IV. v. 40).
- (21) codicis immundi vincula sentit anus (IV. vii. 44).
- (22) tergeminiūque canis sic mihi molle sonet (IV. vii. 52).
- (23) et manibus duris apta puella fui (IV. ix. 50).

When from these twenty-three you have deducted the instances where the adjective *defines* and not merely *describes* (Nos. 3, 14, 16, 17, 22), those where it is quasi-predicative in force (1, 10, 13); the Graecising or other peculiar effects (9, 11); those where the text is hardly above suspicion (5, 8, 15), the remainder is so extremely small—about 10 pentameters in 2,000—as to make each case *prima facie* suspect. And be it observed that Book III. offers only two instances at all, and in both these the adjective plainly defines, not decorates. One would not damn such examples as Nos. 6, 7, 18, 19, etc., unless the suspicion were corroborated from another quarter; but in our example it has cumulative value. For in the couplet

sit sors et nobis talorum interprete iactu
quem gravibus pennis verberet ille puer

there are already symptoms of disease: *et* is unmeaning, or, at the best, unaccountably misplaced; and *nobis* can hardly in reason refer to any but Propertius and Cynthia. What Beroaldus' correction entails is the further change of *et* into *e*; *quem* is for *utrum*. *Quem e nobis* = 'which of us two,' *gravius verberet Amor*. Cf. Ovid *Ars*. I. 204:

nam deus e vobis alter es, alter eris.

This fond pastime for a tête-à-tête birthday party is best illustrated by Catullus XLV., in which first Septimius makes his protestation, *mea Acme, nite perdit amo*, etc., and then Acme

makes hers: *she* is more in love than he is.

ut multo *mihi* maior acriorque
ignis mollibus ardet in medullis.

(To take the comparative as meaning
'more than ever before' is a beastly

suggestion, and, besides, destroys the point of *mollibus*.)

Here the amorous debate is referred to the arbitrament of Heads-or-tails.

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

University College, Glasgow.

NOTE ON OVID, *TRISTIA* III. 6. 8 (AUGUSTUS ET IUPPITER).

In the January number of the *Classical Quarterly* Professor Housman has a piquant note on this line, which not only amused but greatly interested me. It seemed to have a bearing on the cult of Augustus in his lifetime; and I at once turned out the eight passages which he quotes from the *Tristia*, and examined them carefully in order to find out why after his exile Ovid should refer to Augustus as Iuppiter. So far as I know, he was not in the habit of doing this in his earlier works. Incidentally, too, I was curious to know whether Professor Housman's correction of the last word of the line (*Ioui* for *uiro*) would convince me after I had examined his passages. It did entirely convince me on a first reading of his note.

Ovid is writing to a friend, and tells him that their friendship was a well-known fact at Rome; it was not hidden under a bushel.

Quique est in caris animi tibi candor amicis
Cognita sunt ipsi, quem colis, ista *uiro*.

That is, it was well known also to Augustus. No commentator seems to have doubted this; and Heinsius, thinking that *uiro* might mean anyone in Rome, suggested *deo* instead of *uiro*. Professor Housman goes further, and would read *Ioui*, pointing out that Ovid often refers to Augustus as Iuppiter (though not in the nominative) in this very work. The Apollinism of Augustus is perhaps a little overworn of late, and his relation to Iuppiter undervalued: is any light thrown on the latter by these passages? Let me quote them in full.

I. 1. 81:

Uitaret caelum Phaethon, si uiueret, et quos
Optaret stulte, tangere nollet equos.
Me quoque, quae sensi, fateor Iouis arma timere.
Me reor infesto, cum tonat, igne peti.

Here it is plain that Ovid starts his *Tristia* thinking of himself as Phaethon and of Augustus as Iuppiter. He had been telling the story of Phaethon not long before (*Met.* II.), and to think mythologically of his own catastrophe was probably a relief to him. The 'image' remains in his brain.

I. 4. 26 (written during a storm in the Adriatic, which seems to be driving him towards the forbidden Italian coast):

Parcite, caerulei uos saltem numina ponti,
Infestumque mihi sit satis esse Iouem.

The same image is in his head: he has been the victim of Jove's bolt, is he to be also the victim of Neptune's wrath? (Note that Augustus is vaguely alluded to as *deo* in l. 22.)

I. 5. 77:

Cumque minor Ioue sit tumidis qui regnat in
undis,
Illum Neptuni, me Iouis ira premit.

Still the idea of thunderbolt: cf 'me deus oppressit' in l. 75. He is comparing himself with Odysseus, who escaped this but was worried by Neptune.

III. 1. 38. Here for the first time we have a different poetical idea. His poem is imagined finding its way to the house of Augustus and the temple of Apollo with its library. On its way it passes the temple of Iuppiter Stator, and when it gets to the *domus Augusti* it naively asks if this too is not a temple of Iuppiter? Is not that the oak crown of the god over the gate? (really the *corona ciuica* of Augustus):

Non fallimur, inquam,
Et magni uerum est hanc Iouis esse domum.

But this is only a pretty passing

thought: at the end of the poem it is forgotten again:

Caesar ades uoto maxime diue meo!

III. 5. 7. The original image again: writing to a friend who had been good to him in his misfortune, he says:

Ausus es igne Iouis percussus tangere corpus.

III. 11. 62. An exact equivalent of I. 5. 77, quoted above.

IV. 3. 69. The thunderbolt again:

Nec tibi, quod saevis ego sum Iouis ignibus ictus,
Purpureus molli fiat in ore rubor.

V. 2. 46. At first sight this looks like a genuine equation of Augustus and Iuppiter, i.e. one without mythological fancy:

Adloquor en absens absentia numina supplex,
Si fas est homini cum Ioue posse loqui.

But reading on for a few lines we find that Ovid is still thinking of Phaethon:

Parce, precor, minimamque tuo de fulmine partem Deme!

So too in *Ex Ponto* I. 7. 49:

At grauitur cecidi. Quid enim mirabile si quis
A Ioue percussus non leue volnus habet?

I may add *Tristia* II. 215, just to show that in this same *Tristia* Ovid can distinguish Augustus from Iuppiter and compare the two:

Utque deos caelumque simul sublime tuenti
Non uacat exiguis rebus adesse Ioui,
Ex te pendentem sic dum circumspicis orbem,
Effugiunt curas inferiora tuas?

Lastly, let me quote a passage in which Ovid's real attitude to Iuppiter slips out even in his *Tristia*: II. 289: (cf. *Ars. Am.* I. 631):

Quis locus est templis augustinus? Haec quoque uitet
In culpam si qua est ingeniosa suam.

Cum steterit Iouis aede, Iouis succurret in aede
Quam multas matres fecerit ille deus.

It is by this time quite clear to me, and I hope will be to my readers, that Ovid is very far from seriously identifying Augustus with Iuppiter: it is only his poetical mind and the story of Phaethon that leads him, as Professor Housman cautiously puts it (p. 38), to *denote* Augustus by oblique cases of Iuppiter. (I can imagine why he should avoid the nominative, though I find it hard to express the feeling.) This being so, the substitution of *Ioui* for *uiro* in III. 6. 8 fails to appeal to me: there is nothing in the context to suggest it, no allusion to the catastrophe or the thunderbolt. What is in his head is the society of the city, and the *human* relation of Augustus to that society and its talk. *Ioui* here grates on my sense of the fitting. I should greatly prefer *deo*, as e.g. in IV. 4. 45 'Idque deus sentit,' i.e. Augustus. At the same time ('horresco referens') I do not feel absolutely certain that Ovid may not have after all written *uiro*, in spite of Professor Housman's remarks about *colere* ('when a subject "colit Caesarem" he "colit deum" and not "uirm")'. The reader of the *Tristia* would have no doubt as to the person meant; and the context suggests the human rather than the divine Augustus. The two are often strangely mixed up, as in *Tristia* II. 53 ff. and *Ex Ponto* III. 8. 15-24¹; but in this passage I do not find the deity.

W. WARDE FOWLER.

Kingham, Oxon.

¹ Add *Tristia* V. 2. 45 ff., where 'Si fas est homini cum Ioue posse loqui' is closely followed by 'Ouir non ipso quem regis orbe minor.'

NOTES

ΑΣΤΗΡ ΣΕΙΠΙΟΣ IN EUR. *I.A.* 7-8.

MR. HOUSMAN has misapprehended my meaning (*C.R.* 28. 8). Sirius is invisible, for it is below the horizon. Capella is out of the question, for it is out of range: Agamemnon is not gazing in

that direction. The star is well up from the horizon, somewhere within a large circle, with mid-heaven as a centre. Under the circumstances the meridian would be the most unlikely position of all: 'verba ἔτι μεσσήρης non ita premenda' (Hermann). That

the star was a planet occurred to me also (I quote Theon in my article, and his comment on this passage in my *Greek Tragic Poets*); but I preferred Aldebaran, because this star *was known to be ἐγγύς Πλειάδος*. It is hardly conceivable that a Greek general would have been less familiar with Mars, Venus, Saturn, or Jupiter, than was his servants; nor would he need to be told that the star in question was 'near the Pleiades.'

J. E. HARRY.

University of Cincinnati.

GREEK ELEGIACS.

THE BREAK AFTER A TROCHEE IN THE FOURTH FOOT OF THE HEXAMETER.

A PRIZE version in the *Saturday Westminster Gazette* of December 24 (26), 1914, was accorded especial praise, and received the honour of being reprinted in the Educational Supplement of *The Times* of January 5, 1915. One of the hexameters in it ended *παρὰ σοῖσι πόδεσσιν βάλομαι*, and this, as well as a line ending *παύροιθεν ἐγεύσασθαι κρήνης* in an introductory poem to the *Essays and Studies presented to William Ridgeway* (Cambridge, 1913), make it possible to doubt whether English scholars realise the extreme rarity of such a break—so common and elegant in Latin, *modulatur amabile carmen*—in the Greek hexameter, particularly in Elegiacs. The Greek Anthology contains well over 16,000 hexameters, and a rough count seems to show only the following instances of this break: *Anth. Pal.* i. 31 (Marinus?), 102 (Menander Proctictor); vii. 57, 96, 104, 126 twice (all Diogenes Laertius); ix. 452,¹ 595,² 655² (all incert.); xi. 130 (Pollianus), 173 (Philippus), 425 (incert.); xv. 32, 34² (all Arethas Diaconus), 37, 40 thrice (all

¹ This instance should probably be omitted. It occurs in the second of a series of fifty-two short pieces of hexameters (mostly) on mythological subjects, obviously all by the same author. He frequently omits the augment, and *μετέπειτα δ' ἐνόσφισε* can equally well be read *μετέπειτα δὲ νόσφισε*, and this division of words is actually adopted by Stadtmueller.

² Lines with extremely licentious and irregular caesuras.

Cometas); *Anth. Plan.* iii. 21; iv. 174, 302; *Append. Epigr.* 119, 170, 185, 192, 217, 247, 261 (all incert.).³ These twenty-nine instances occur largely in writers of the Christian age, and probably none is found in a poem of any real poetic feeling: there are, however, perhaps four instances in Theognis and one in Tyrtaeus. In poems written entirely in hexameters the break is possibly not quite so rare as in elegiacs (eight of the examples from the *Anthology* are in such poems); even so, its occurrence is most infrequent. It seems therefore that its employment in versions which profess to be constructed on classical models might be considered as an actual mistake: the rule is really not stated with sufficient force and clarity in the standard works on metre, such as those of Christ, Havet, and Gleditsch.

S. GASELEE.

Magdalene College, Cambridge.

NOTES ON VESPA.

P.L.M. iv., p. 379 (Baehrens), v. 1.

ter ternae uarias cuncteque traditis artes.

So T: S has *cunctaque: uarias cunctis* Riese: *uarie cunctas* Baehrens.

v. 32 has *cunctas qui tradidit artes*, but that seems insufficient ground for abandoning the form of the MSS.: perhaps

uarias sanctae quae.

v. II.

numina per Cereris iuro, per Apollinis arcus!

Vespa was too good a rhetorician to have missed the antithesis. We should read:

lumina per Cereris.

v. 30.

prouocor ut dicam: militonem tu roso temptas quem docuit notus Cerealis fingere panes urbe Placentinus, cunctas qui tradidit artes Pythagoras populo nescis quam suaserit olim?

A *locus desperatus*. I give the passage as in Baehrens' text: the conjectures are innumerable. In v. 30 I would suggest:

molitorem tirone temptas,

³ It is unlikely that this list is complete; but the very few more examples that might be found by a closer inspection would not affect the contention as to the very great rarity of this break.

putting an interrogation mark after *Placentinus*. Wernsdorf had already seen that *cunctas qui tradidit artes* belonged to Pythagoras (? is *cunctas* again an error for *sanctas*). *molitor* occurs only in the Digest so far as I have found, but it may well have been used here.

As to v. 31 all the commentators seem to make *Cerealis* the name of the baker's teacher. As no other proper name occurs of such a kind, may it not be simply *cereales*? Translate, then:

'Do you, a mere novice (alluding to the priority of bread to meats), challenge

a miller, who was taught by the inventor of Placentine cakes, whom his city makes famous?'

v. 82.

exseco sic gallos quasi (quas T.) Berecynthia Gallos

surely *qualis*. Teuffel defends *quasi*, which Baehrens also keeps as a mark of erudition, but Verg. *Aen.* vi. 784, was impossible to miss.

R. T. C.

Perth, N.B.

REVIEWS

THE PRIMITIVE TEXT OF THE GOSPELS AND ACTS.

The Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts. By ALBERT C. CLARK. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914. 4s.

PROFESSOR CLARK'S incursion into the most complex of all fields of textual criticism might be expected to bring advantages such as have often accrued to Biblical science by the wholesome neglect of the rule that keeps the shoemaker to his last. An expert trained for this new work by long familiarity with the ways of Ciceronian copyists, he can obviously enlighten us as to the weakness of scribes whose fellows may have dealt in like manner with the Gospels. He tells us that the careless omission of whole lines, one or many at a time, is the badge of all their tribe; and he is led accordingly to hold that the canon *breuior lectio potior* is to be reversed, and the fullest text is in general to be taken as primitive. In this of course Professor Clark has had predecessors. Mr. Cronin applied the principle to the omissions of the Sinaiticus in the Fourth Gospel (*Journ. Theol. Stud.* xiii. 563 ff., 1912); and Dr. Rendel Harris included it among the various processes discussed in an elaborate paper in *Amer. Journ. Philol.* iii. (1882) appendix. But its uses in this book go far beyond anything previously attempted. Thus it is held to support the existence of Mk 16⁹⁻²⁰ and Jn 7⁵³—8¹¹ in 'an archetype of the Gospels

in book-form, which cannot be later than the middle of the second century.' Lest some Rip van Winkle should too hastily arise at the sound of such doctrine, and offer this little volume on Dean Burgon's tomb, as a tardy fulfilment of his famous prediction, we must be careful to observe Professor Clark's limitations. He is not concerned with 'the ultimate problems of New Testament autographs,' and starts with the text current in the second century. The Synoptic Problem and Higher Criticism generally he promises to avoid, and he keeps his promise. The careful reader of this book must therefore begin by asking whether in a very complex and many-sided problem a single method can be expected to secure really trustworthy results. And if Professor Clark's thesis were conceded, must we necessarily assume that the reconstructed text of A.D. 150 represents better than its rivals the autographs published between fifty and a hundred years earlier? The classical scholar, thankful when his archetypes are not more than ten times as distant in date from their originals, may too readily assume that a text of this date is necessarily better than one of A.D. 250. But it at least needs to be proved; and the full acceptance of Professor Clark's canon would leave this proof as far away as ever.

I shall of course attempt no discus-

D

sion of the palaeographical case involved: a mere philologist has no business in that galley. I am able now¹ to refer to Sir F. G. Kenyon's criticism in the *Church Quarterly* for October, 1914 (pp. 68-72), which relieves a non-expert from any uneasiness he might feel lest some obvious questions that occur to him may be impertinences. I am glad to find that I really was right in asking whether absolutely any omission of some length might not be proved to be an exact number of lines or pages, when the elasticity of the unit is taken into account. 'With this latitude of variation, the proof of omissions becomes as easy as a Baco-Shakespearian cryptogram.' With this and other palaeographical objections Sir F. G. Kenyon riddles the new theory from stem to stern. Leaving this side of the case alone, I want to urge the claims of other interested parties whom Professor Clark keeps out of court. A proposal to canonise Codex Bezae compels us to hear the devil's advocate, and he cannot be forbidden to range beyond the narrow limits allowed by this book. Not that I am a candidate for that post. In bidding us bow down and worship in the Cambridge Library instead of the Vatican, Professor Clark is only bettering an instruction which all our newer textual critics have been giving us in a less extreme form. Hort usually treated D as an irredeemably bad egg. Professor Clark labels it 'fresh,' though not quite 'new-laid.' My own opinion is that parts of it are excellent, but nature rebels against swallowing it whole.

It will be noticed that in this matter the new doctrine involves a curious inversion of Hort's. For the great Cambridge master D was not worth a walk down King's Parade unless it left out something which the other MSS. contained. Oxford now comes to assure us that the Cantabrigiensis must be followed, except when it yields to the universal failing and perpetrates an omission. We are, it seems, to class

the β -text² omission of Mk 16⁹⁻²⁰, and the δ -text omissions in Luke's Passion narrative, as accidental, and reflecting an archetype in which the omission covered an exact number of lines. It will probably occur to most readers that it is strange to explain the omission of the last paragraph of a book by a theory depending on calculation of so many lines omitted. Are we intended to assume that the scribe wrote as far as *ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ*, went off to dinner, and on his return forgot where he was and turned over a page? It seems much simpler to assume, as is usually done, that the archetype of all our MSS. and versions was a roll which had lost its conclusion, frayed off, as so often happens at the end.

The book consists almost entirely of elaborate enumerations as to the omissions found in several of the great MSS., and the Greek copy which underlies the Lewis Syriac version. These omissions are classified according to the number of letters left out, and exercises in G.C.M. tell us the length of line in the original. Thus \aleph , itself written with 13 or 14 letters a line, 'is derived from an ancestor with an average of 10-12 letters'; another ancestor is suspected with a longer line. The other Sinai document is similarly analysed. Professor Clark counts 485 places in its underlying Greek where 10 letters and over are omitted. Of these 196 involve 10-12 letters, 32 drop 20-22, and six 31. It may be easily admitted that in these cases, or a large number of them, the accidental omission of one, two, or three lines in the Greek text might supply a *vera causa* for a translator's aberration. The phenomena of Ciceronian MSS., Professor Clark's starting-point, assure us that the best literary scribes were prone to err this way.

The table for the Lewis Syriac suggests, however, that we must lay more emphasis than readers generally will upon Professor Clark's own caveats that 'much must have been due to accident,' and that certain classes of omissions 'go back to an earlier stage

¹ I should explain that this review was written six months ago, and lost in the post, so that I have had to rewrite it after much time has been lost.

² I use Kenyon's notation, and wish Professor Clark had done the same.

in the development.' There are 124 instances where 13-16 letters are involved, 48 of 17-19, 35 of 23-28, and 10 of 33-37; and we have a collection of longer omissions ranging over a great variety of totals—41, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 54, 65, 70, 83, 128, 132, 167, and 262 letters. Stress is laid on these last, since 'mere accident, apart from line-division, becomes less likely' as the omissions become longer. 'Most of the omissions were made in a previous copy': the immediate model was probably one with 14-16 letters per line, accounting for 78 of these omissions, but most of the omissions are assigned on internal evidence to the smaller unit. When we have two divisors like 10-12 and 14-16 to operate with, we feel that the bed of Procrustes is very accommodating. Let us call these respectively *a* and *b*, and allow each symbol the three values given. The first six of the 'longer omissions' for which numbers are given above become thus 4*a* (i.e., $3 \times 10 + 11$), 3*b* ($2 \times 14 + 15$), 3*b* ($14 + 2 \times 15$), and similarly 3*b*, 3*b*, 3*b*—all three of which may also be 4*a*, as their two predecessors may be. In the whole series the only members which will not fit both divisors are 41 (4*a*), 49 (neither), 50, 51 and 54 (5*a*), 65 (6*a*), and 83 (8*a*). Above 49, if my arithmetic is not astray, every possible number of letters can be expressed in complete lines of 10, 11, or 12 letters; above 97, every number can similarly be expressed in 14, 15, or 16 letters. There are, moreover, only 11 possible omissions of over nine letters which could not be expressed as *xa*, only 36 of over 13 letters which could not be *xb*. Even small omissions therefore, given two such elastic units, have an excellent chance of being adaptable to one line or the other, especially when we are at liberty to retain or drop movable -ν, to spell *ai* or *ε*, *ei* or *ι* at will, or write letters small at the end of a line as *ς* does constantly. Since then Professor Clark's explanation will account for absolutely any omission of ten letters and over, are we not cherishing a natural instinct when we feel shy of a pill that will cure everything?

For when we proceed to look into

these omissions we find that the Lewis shares a good many of them with authorities of different classes. In Tischendorf's apparatus we find company for it in Mk 9³ *Xan*, Lk 6⁴⁰ ΓΑ* 48^{ev}, Lk 20¹⁹ Marcion (who also omitted τὸν λαὸν before), Jn 5¹² ΓΑ* α¹⁰ *b*, Lk 12⁹ *e* syr^{cod}, Lk 14²⁷ Μ*ΡΓα^l *mu*, Mt 5⁴⁷ *k* (and Tatian, says von Soden), Mt 5³⁰ *D*. Are these independent errors arising from similar causes, or must we find some common ancestry? The difficulty here is, however, nothing to that in which Professor Clark's passion for inclusiveness lands him in two notable passages, where he is certainly the first to recognise veritable Holy Writ. In Mt 27⁴⁹ *ς* B add what Hort called a very early interpolation, taken from Jn 19³⁴ almost verbatim. It makes absolute havoc of the sense, but Professor Clark 'would merely point out that the passage may well represent six lines of the archetype' (p. 56). And when we come to the last page of Mark, the ingenious theory is offered that the 'Shorter Conclusion,' which stands first in the two or three MSS. that contain it, is original, and the 'Longer Conclusion' follows it up and expands it. I notice, however, that the new interpolation found in W is a little too much for even such faith to digest. And yet it could indisputably have been written so as to occupy an exact number of complete lines: the formulae 46*a* and 33*b* (as above) will represent it equally well.

I venture to think that the most significant lesson of Professor Clark's failure is the impossibility of helping forward the solution of very complex problems by employing one method and closing our eyes to the rest. We are tempted to such behaviour by the instinct which forbids every scholar to tread in unfamiliar fields; and we cannot but sympathise with this great specialist in Cicero when he refuses to discuss synoptic problems, or other sides of New Testament textual criticism which lie outside the method he has chosen to set forth. But since his method will apply to absolutely any omission except the shortest, we cannot possibly exclude the consideration of alternative accounts. In Mt 5³⁰ it is no doubt easy to say that the omission was in a common ancestor

of D and the Lewis, where 13 lines of the shorter unit, or 9 of the longer, were dropped by homoeoteleuton. But this Logion comes to us from both of our main Synoptic sources; and the addition of a saying about the right hand can be easily assigned to Mk 9⁴⁸, which was taken over in a shortened form in the doublet at Mt 18⁶. The omission is therefore right, as those of D so often are, even in places where Westcott and Hort did not apply their principle.

It will be well at this point to hear the conclusion of the whole matter, as expressed in the last paragraph of the book. 'The oldest text is that quoted by the earliest Fathers and rendered in the most ancient versions.' As against the β -text (Hort's 'Neutral'), which 'can claim no earlier testimony on its behalf than the partial support of Origen,' the δ -family ('Western') 'presents the text which was used by the predecessors of Origen, and can boast of a series of witnesses going back to the generation which succeeded the Apostles. In Z [the δ -text], therefore, I recognise the primitive text.' Quotations follow from P. Corssen and Professor Burkitt, which however are not as congruous as Professor Clark seems to regard them. The former, in 1892, set down the β -text as 'merely the reflection of a recension capriciously formed in the fourth century, which, like every modern version, must have been subjective in character.' This sounds well, but one would like to know how we are to avoid subjectivity. If 'Z' is to be accepted solidly (except in its omissions!), we must know how to find Z, and it is largely an unknown quantity. Professor Burkitt's words are more helpful. 'Let us come out of the land of Egypt, and let us see whether the agreement of East and West, of Edessa and Carthage, will not give us a surer basis on which to establish our text of the Gospels.' We must put that earlier dictum with teaching which Professor Burkitt has given us more recently, proving that the Old Syriac is really 'Western' in readings it shared with the Old Latin and got from Tatian, but genuinely Antiochene of a very early date in places where it differs from Tatian. The isolation of this very early Antioch text gives us three primi-

tive types, Antiochene, Western and Egyptian; and the agreement of two of these gives us the most hopeful method of escaping subjectivity. But to edit with completeness and certainty either the Antiochene or the Western text is unhappily beyond our present resources, even if we allow that Westcott and Hort gave us approximately what is now generally regarded as a third (not 'fourth'!) century Egyptian revision.

Let us assume, however, that we are to ignore the β -text, and take the early Egyptian record from the Sahidic and Clement. In the Gospels we have the Old Syriac to help us, but we shall have some difficulty in catching the voice of Edessa when we come to the Acts. This suggests a question to which Professor Clark gives us no answer. What are we to do when the δ -text is not shorter or longer than the β -text, but simply different? In the Acts we have a large number of additions in D, which I gather Professor Clark would accept almost *en bloc*, since they could all of them be expressed in *στίχοι*. Here I should very often be tempted to agree, as for instance in regard to the statement (Acts 19⁹) that Paul used the lecture-room during the heat of the day, while Tyrannus was enjoying his siesta: whether internal evidence is always, or even generally, as convincing, I should gravely doubt. But when D or its fellows make a statement differing largely in words but not in fact, are we bound to accept its form, just because the text as a whole has earlier attestation? Has Professor Clark really faced the difficulty of preferring δ to β (or even α !) in a very large number of places? The harmonising tendencies of δ are alone sufficient to forbid the short and easy method of accepting δ (when known), with supplements from β when δ yields to the scribes' besetting sin of omission. The influence of Harmonies was bound to cause much assimilation of parallel records; and it seems a perfectly sound canon that we should generally prefer a reading which involves a difference, to one which may be due merely to assimilation. And can we really doubt that many variations in D and the Old Latin are due to mere paraphrase, and have no intrinsic

claim to be preferred to the familiar alternative? Professor Clark boldly argues (p. 81) that in Acts 'the Greek MSS. in general were drawn from a single ancestor written in *στίχοι*, such as those found in D, and had in a number of cases omitted lines of their original.' Before we can possibly accept this, we must study the text of D, which is assumed to be free from the infection of this imperfect archetype, and apply to it a variety of tests the consideration of which Professor Clark excludes. Is there really any probability that this all-round examination will be other than eclectic in its results?

I venture to close this notice with a word of personal opinion, though with the diffidence appropriate in one whose study of New Testament textual criticism is not that of a specialist. I have, however, qualified perhaps for one contribution by a protracted study of orthography as established for vernacular Greek of the first century by our various new evidence. I have been much struck by the number of cases in which the old uncials preserve spellings which can be proved current in the time of the autographs, but obsolete long before the fourth century. Faithful in minutiae, they might reasonably be expected to be faithful also in greater matters. Anyhow, orthography seems to demonstrate the dependence of α and B as well as D upon exemplars of at least the second century: that all three include later elements is of course not excluded. Is it not possible to explain 'the hypothesis that gross license began to reign in sub-Apostolic times, but that the "neutral" text was preserved in some unknown place' (p. 111), which Professor Clark thinks 'most violent and in itself very unlikely,' by reference to the conditions under which the Christians' sacred books must have been handed down through ages of persecution? Cicero was copied in scriptoria: having secured the orator's head, the proscription apparently did not try to suppress even the Philippics. But how often was the scriptorium used for the Gospels? Little books, like Hort's archetype of C in the Apocalypse, copied often by 'prentice hands, with many abbreviations and a generally non-

literary form, must have made up largely the ancestry of the sumptuous codices written in the days of peace. Nor were the scribes mechanical copyists. They lived when oral tradition was abundant and highly valued, and when no canonical sanctity protected the written text. If an itinerant preacher repeated a Logion he had heard long ago from an apostolic man, it was sure to be copied into some more or less appropriate place in a Gospel, and transferred from margin to text at the next copying. The copyists, moreover, had the substance of their text by heart. They needed it constantly when no copy was available, and it was usually not safe to carry their books about. It was easy therefore to relapse into paraphrase. The confusion of the Old Latin text, as witnessed by Jerome, and by the infinite variety of our extant MSS., presents conditions suggestively similar; and we might perhaps even say the same of the Old Syriac, if the differences between our two witnesses may be to some extent credited to such a cause. The text therefore was peculiarly liable to interpolation, if by this we only mean the insertion of matter not due to the original author. We may both endorse the omission of these by β or δ text, and hold the conviction that they often preserved an authentic tradition. Will not such considerations dispose of Professor Clark's contention that it is easier to omit than to invent?

I suggest therefore that we are free to give the δ -text very much greater weight than Hort conceded, and frankly to make the β -text a revision, but to prefer the latter still in most places where omissions are not concerned. We assume that Alexandrian scholars in the third century—possibly under Origen's inspiration—felt themselves driven by the existing chaos to attempt for the Greek very much what Jerome was later attempting for the Latin. They must have used some MSS. which stood very near the autographs, and were largely free from the license which almost everybody feels compelled to credit to the 'Western' developments. This leaves us full liberty to believe that the revisers often wrongly rejected δ readings. Till the experts succeed in

tracing some new principle which will objectively sift them, we must still continue to write on the margin of our Westcott and Hort those δ variants which take our individual fancy.

As to the plea that the β -text has no patristic backing, I would suggest that if these postulated early MSS. were prior to the processes that produced the new elements in the δ -text, their survival in a centre of learning might even be unknown till scholars unearthed them. Even a single copy, recognised as very old and good by the instinct of a scholar like Origen, might easily have been responsible for most of the material brought in by the revisers, who gave it a precedence very much like that of B in Hort's regard. The revision need never have become popular, or even known outside Alexandria or Egypt. The time of its production was not favourable, and the δ -text was at least as hard to dislodge as the Genevan Version was when challenged by the Authorised. And meanwhile the α -text was on its way, evolved when the Church had left outward danger behind, and was free to devote herself to doctrinal discussions that made an authoritative recension necessary. This was achieved under the inspiration of the instinct which Professor Clark so heartily approves. A net which gathered of every kind, it took in δ elements and β , as well as its own mostly stylistic novelties; and this inclusiveness no doubt commended it. In a comparatively short time it had

driven its older rivals from the field, not to yield its place to them until the nineteenth century was nearly over.

What has been said must suffice for the indications of my scepticism as to Professor Clark's case for D against B as our primary authority. I feel that his doctrine of omissions deserves careful consideration as a factor in very many places, though tests which he excludes from his survey prevent us from allowing it weight in very many more. I am abundantly ready to be convinced of the claim of D and its company to a hearing in multitudes of places where it was shut out by the great critics of Hort's school, and in no small proportion of them we should give their reading preference. But I do not see how we can give them blind allegiance; and I must confess that Professor Clark has not persuaded me to relax the 'smile' of incredulity with which we hear that such incongruous passages as the end of our Mark, or the Pericope Adulterae, are to be taken as composed for the places they now occupy, even if they did hold that place as early as 150 A.D. But it need not be said that if Professor Clark does not carry our assent, a laborious and skilful argument like his must advance our knowledge by sending us back afresh to our first principles, to reinforce them with newly gathered argument, if not as he desires to abandon them for doctrines new and somewhat strange.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

Didsbury College, Manchester.

THREE CHICAGO MONOGRAPHS.

The Christology in the Apostolic Fathers.

By ALONSO ROSECRANS STARK. 10" x 7". Pp. xii + 60. Chicago: The University Press, 1912. (No price given.)

Syntax of the Participle in the Apostolic Fathers. By HENRY B. ROBISON.

10" x 7". Pp. 45. Chicago: The University Press, 1913. 2s.

A Study of Augustine's Versions of

Genesis. By JOHN S. MCINTOSH. 10" x 7". Pp. x + 130. Chicago: The University Press, 1912. 3s.

THE Chicago University Press—represented in this country by the Cambridge University Press—is doing a good service in publishing a number of scholarly monographs at a low price on technical literary subjects, for which in the nature of things there cannot be a large demand.

In the first of the three before us Dr. Stark discusses the Christology of the Apostolic Fathers, and finds that for this purpose they fall into three groups: (i.) 1 Clement and the Didache, which emphasise the subordination of

Christ to the Father; (ii.) Ignatius, Polycarp and 2 Clement, where Christ is designated God, and becomes equal to the Father in respect of soteriological work; (iii.) Barnabas, Hermas and the Epistle to Diognetus, in which cosmological functions are ascribed to Christ. The relevant passages are carefully collected and to some extent discussed. In places a fuller discussion seems to be needed—for instance, the meaning of the phrase *παῖς θεοῦ*. References are generally given with liberality—the last paragraph on p. 24 is an exception—but several serious misprints have crept in among them. For instance, on p. 7 read Ps. xxxiv. 11-17 for Ps. liii. 1-11, and xvi. 15 for xv. 16. The reference to Philo on p. 4 is given in a manner hardly worthy of a learned thesis—namely, an English rendering taken from a book of Archbishop Trench.

Dr. Robison confines himself to one point of grammar. The 3,100 cases in which the participle occurs in the Apostolic Fathers are tabulated and arranged with great minuteness. For example, to give one calculation, there are 1,252 instances of participles where the logical force is adverbial. These are divided into Time 271, Condition 43, Concession 31, Cause 102, Purpose and Result 13, Means 41, Manner 189, Attendant Circumstances 562, the references being given in every case. The author's claim in the preface that the study has a value 'in the light which is thrown upon the usages of the New Testament books, and in the aid that is given for their interpretation' is hardly justified, since in a final comparison of the Apostolic Fathers with New Testament Greek no instance is given where any light is thrown on the exegesis of the New Testament. Dr. Robison concludes 'that the Apostolic Fathers are freer from Hebraistic influences than the New Testament' in their use of the participle, but omits to say to what narrow limits Hebraistic influences on

New Testament Greek are reduced by most present-day scholars. However, grammatical studies in any given field no doubt deserve to be prosecuted for their own sake, and the present thesis is a most careful and laborious contribution to the science of language.

One caution should perhaps be expressed in regard to both these books. 'Apostolic Fathers' is a convenient label for a number of early Christian documents not included in the Canon, which happen to survive. Chronologically, the earliest of them is probably prior to parts of the New Testament. In no sense do they form a literary unity. Such investigations as the above must therefore be considered in the light of a series of studies on separate books, and all generalisations avoided as likely to prove misleading.

The third thesis is a contribution to the study of the Old Latin Bible. The writer's purpose is first to reconstruct the text of Genesis used by Augustine, then to compare it with other Old Latin fragments, the Vulgate and the LXX, and finally to investigate the Latinity of the reconstructed text. He is handicapped in his task by the uncritical nature of some of the texts at his disposal, even the Vienna *Corpus* being far from satisfactory in its treatment of Biblical quotations. The most interesting part of the book is the treatment of the linguistic problem. Are the peculiarities of the Old Latin due to the intrusion of colloquial elements, so that the version becomes an authority for the popular speech of the period? The answer is in the negative. Dr. McIntosh concludes that they are the effect of Graecisms, and Hebraisms emerging through the LXX; the influence of popular Latin is secondary, nor is it possible to deduce from the language the original home of the Latin version.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

Cavendish, Suffolk.

THE METAMORPHOSIS OF OVID.

P. Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphoseon Libri XV., Lactanti Placidi qui dicitur Narrationes Fabularum Ovidianarum. Recensuit apparatu critico instruxit HUGO MAGNUS. Accedunt Index Nominum et tres Tabulae Photographicae. Berolini apud Weidmannos, MDCCCXCIV. 1 vol. 9" x 6". Pp. xxxiv + 766. 3os. net.

THIS is a book that has been long expected, and will be eagerly scanned by students of Ovid. Ellis used to say that it would take a lifetime to produce an adequate edition of the *Metamorphoses*, and it is almost thirty years since the present editor began to 'peg out his claim.' The final output is now before us, and as regards the labour and devotion that have been lavished on the work there can be no two opinions. Dr. Magnus has long been honourably known for his series of preliminary studies, enumerated on p. xxx, and his *editio minor* of the poem for schools. In his *magnum opus* he now gives us first, in smooth and lucid Latin, an 'ideal' biography of the text, a brief description of the chief codices employed, a *résumé* of the work which his predecessors have done, and hints for those who may come after him (see especially pp. xxv and xxvi). In the collection of *testimonia* and the collation of MSS., both, but especially the former, planned on a generous scale, he has received and acknowledges much assistance from his friends. Photographic facsimiles are added to show, as only facsimiles can, the MS. position in regard to the typical crux at I. 545 ff. Another excellent feature is the republication, with an *app. crit.*, of the prose arguments attributed to Lactantius Placidus (see p. 627) from MSS. which contain them. For the *app. crit.* of the poem M has himself collated—for the first time, apparently, and in full—Marcianus 223 (saec. xi.-xii.) = F, while the readings of the rather numerous and important fragments are religiously compiled from various sources and presented under a new nomenclature which is pretty sure, I should say, to

be generally adopted, and will no doubt be a convenience later. Among these fragments appears for the first time the *Fragmentum Hauniense* (κ), containing the greater part of Books IX.-X., which also M has collated himself and of which more anon.

M's view of the MS. problem is *prima facie* sane and safe. It may not be agreed unanimously that the MSS. fall into two families, and two only—O and X; but all will allow that the readings of O, when available, must be considered first. Unfortunately the chief representatives of this family, viz., M and N, which descend, as their lacunae prove, from one original through copies Y and Z, are not only *mutuli* but themselves occasionally interpolated. Hence the generally admitted importance of the *deteriores* and the complexity of the editor's task.

M was singled out by Heinsius as supreme, but it was treated by him only as *primus inter pares*. It is therefore not a little disappointing to find that more of his *vetustiores* have not been traced and collated for this edition. Perhaps some day an enthusiast (or a committee of enthusiasts) may institute such a search in the libraries of Europe as Heinsius made in his time for MSS. of this poem, and as Professor Gardner Hale has made in ours for MSS. of Catullus.

It must be said at once that this edition has the defects of its qualities. It is a record for the specialist and the man of leisure, not a guide for the general reader or the busy student.

In planning out his work, as regards the MS. problem, the editor had to choose between two alternatives. (1) Preaching as he does the pre-eminence of O, he might well have based his text on the O family alone, giving its evidence in full detail and summarising *as briefly as possible* the contribution of the X family (*i.e.* the rest of the exceedingly numerous MSS. of the poem.) This is what Riese did and did well. It is also the line for which M's preliminary studies had qualified him and prepared his public; or (2) he

might, like Heinsius, have surveyed the whole field. Heinsius edited the text 'ἐκλεκτικῶς,' it is true, but from collations of some sixty-five MSS. or more.¹ Recognising fully the value of **M** and **N**, both of which he collated throughout, Heinsius yet gave the other authorities their due, and was therefore able repeatedly to correct from them the many slips of the **O** family. Had he only published his collations in full, there would be nothing left for any modern editor to do. As it is, **M** draws freely (but with little or no acknowledgment) on the Heinsius excerpts contained in Burmann. Hence the numerous codices of which we read the names in the *app. crit.* but have no account given in the Introduction. When **M** has had the credit for his recollections of **M** and **N**, **h** and (?) **l**, it must be admitted that his *app. crit.*, with the important exceptions of **κ** and **F**, is mainly a compilation and therefore, in view of the high pretensions which it makes, a disappointment. Failing to show the courage of his convictions by adopting the first alternative, he has overloaded the *app. crit.* to a deplorable extent by gathering into it at haphazard not only the Heinsius excerpts mentioned, but whatever published or unpublished collations of inferior MSS. he could find—*g* (Pet-schenig), *p* (Bothe), 'c Sprotii' ('raro ab Heinsio laudatus et inferioris ut uidetur notae,' says Loers), and *s*, which he most unfairly calls a pillar of Heinsius' text. Having done this he professes to have given in full all the evidence that has come down to us.

This question of plan is fundamental: and if the principle **M** has chosen be unsound, it must determine our judgment of the whole. But before passing on to consider in detail the collations of some of the MSS. cited, with which I am more or less intimately acquainted, it should be observed that as a record the book will in any case have a value of its own for the specialist, as showing which of the conjectures—printed very many of them no doubt, 'ne iterum proferantur'—and which of the MSS.

—*g*, *p*, *s*, to wit—may be safely left behind for the future.

M's reports of the readings of the chief British Museum MS., Add. 11967 (saec. x.-xi.), = **β**, are sometimes defective and sometimes incorrect. There is a *suppressio ueri* at vi. 77 (the *not. crit.* should run fretū **β**¹, equū s.l. **β**²) and a *suggestio falsi* at VI. 200, where whatever the reading of **β**¹ may have been, it was not 'Ites aiΔes' ('possibly "auies"; anyhow not a Δ,' says Mr. Gilson, the Keeper of the MSS.). At V. 343 *sumā st* (*sic*) is clearly not 'sumus deletum,' etc., as **M** contends, but 'sumum' (a dittography of *sum*; cf. ad IX. 387), corrected later to 'sunt.' The scribe makes an exactly similar mistake ('miserere' for 'miserere') at 626 infra. 'Pauent' at VI. 58 is by no means *paene eras*. At V. 657 (and elsewhere) **β** has 'quod,' not 'qui': it is **M** (not the scribe) quem 'compendiorum similitudo fefellit!' At V. 285 it has *desi*(d *partim eras*)*erant*.² The Marcianus has 'desi|erant. Fuitne 'deciderant imbres'? Cf. *Fast.* II 494. Photographs of the MS. show no trace of a virgula either over 'cornu' at II. 874 or over 'unda' at III. 200. At III. 218 'niue is' (*sic*) was worth noting in view of the variant 'niueus.' At p. 664, line 1, I would suggest 'suspensus a caute' (for the corrupt 'acute'), though in Apollodorus it is from a pine that Marsyas is suspended. Lastly, in a suspected line a clue like 'Indo tata' (*sic β*) at IV. 757 is surely worth recording and following. A British Museum MS. (Kings 26, saec. xi.-xii.) has here, from the first hand, 'Indorata,' and in the line before, 'Andromaden' (*sic*). Fortasse, 'Protinus, Andromeda, te tanti praemia facti, Indo nata, rapit.'³ **β** is (in Korn's phrase) 'paene gemellus Marciani,' and its evidence cannot therefore be scrutinised too carefully.

For another British Museum MS. of the first rank, Harleianus 2610 (= **e** in

² See Chatelain, *Paléographie des Classiques Latins*, Planche xcv.

³ Cf. Anth. Pal. V. 132 . . . καὶ Περσεὶς Ἰνδοῦς ἡπάραρ' Ἀνδρομέδης; Ovid, *de Arte Am.* I. 53, III. 191, etc.; and for Andromeda, Lachm. Lucretius, p. 405. At *Met.* XIII. 523 the MSS. waver between 'do|abere' and 'donabere.'

¹ See the list enumerated in Loers, *Praefatio*.

this new nomenclature), M uses with acknowledgments Ellis's collation.¹ Speaking of the MS. from hearsay only, he yet impugns the date (late tenth century) assigned to it by Maunde Thompson. He is unaware that it contains in the margins, from a contemporary hand, the prose arguments by 'Lactantius' for Book I., fabb. 2-10 (with part of 1); and he expresses regret that the bulk of the MS. has perished ('partem multo maiorem eius periisse'), when, as a matter of fact, the scribe stopped short at III. 622, leaving the last page, fol. 37 verso, blank, so that we still possess every line he ever wrote.

Differing thus from Maunde Thompson about the age of ϵ , about the age of N our editor is at issue with another very eminent authority, Dr. Loew, who assigns the MS. to the twelfth century,² not (as M) to the eleventh. As for the ingenious theory which he bases (p. xiv) on the present state of N—'manus prima desinit fol. 188^v uersu xiv 838 . . . quod M desinit octo uersibus ante, uersu 830, id olim recte ita explicasse mihi uideor, ut dicerem *librum O uersu 838 desuisse* (the italics are mine). Huius codicis facta esse duo apographa,' etc.

Here M should certainly have mentioned that the last line in the original hand of N is also the last line of the verso of fol. 188, which is itself apparently the last leaf of a quire—a truly remarkable coincidence this, that N should reach the end of his exemplar *and the end of his own vellum* simultaneously! The facts are more naturally explained on the hypothesis that part of the original script of N has perished, and that the loss was afterwards repaired by a later hand. But if N ever contained the whole or part of Book XV. in the original hand, its position becomes extremely interesting. For it has the prose arguments in the margin only (Riese, p. xxxi), not in the text; and two of the three signs of grace which, according to M, a MS. of the O

family must have, are the absence of Book XV. and the presence in the text (not the margin) of the 'Lactantius' arguments.

The evidence of κ should be carefully weighed, for it has affinities with the lost *Fragmentum Spirense*. M pronounces it to be 'saec. xii. exeuntis.' English expert opinion puts it a hundred years earlier. The Copenhagen authorities lent the MS. in December, 1913, to the Bodleian, where it was examined by Mr. Madan and adjudged by him to be late eleventh century. Sir George Warner and Mr. Gilson arrived independently at the same conclusion.

At IX. 415 it has 'addat' in the text and 'esse uictoris' (*sic*) *contra metrum*. Read, perhaps, 'addat neue necem sinat esse auctoris inultam.'³ The 'Lactantius' runs thus: 'petit a Ioue liberis suis, ut ultores *patris* essent, annos *adiceret*' (similarly Apollodorus III. 7. 6. 1 . . . *ἵνα τὸν τοῦ πατρὸς τισῶνται φόνον*). At X. 239 it has 'pro qua sui' (*sic*). Fortasse 'pro quaestu' (see the prose argument); but this involves altering 'st tamen' to 'set tamen' in the line before.⁴ At X. 647 'agro' ('auro', κ) seems preferable to the Vulgate 'aruo.' The repetition (from 644) is Ovidian. And at X. 349 'acro' may perhaps favour 'acri' (*ἰταμοῖς ὄφειν, Plan.*).

For the prose arguments κ is often a help; and here M does less than justice to its readings, which he sometimes depreciates and sometimes misstates them. For instance, at p. 682, line 1, it has 'inibi,' not 'inibit.' Here M and N are badly interpolated; κ 's text seems sound, and should be adopted. At p. 682, line 9, it has 'eique' (*sic*), a slight but distinct improvement on the 'atque' of the others. At p. 686, line 7,

³ For this use of *auctor* cf. *Tristia*, IV. 4. 26 and 34; *Met.* VI. 172.

⁴ Two other misstatements in M's note on this line need correction. N has *qua* (not *quo*), and M's reading is quite uncertain. 'qu' (a *eras*) M,' says M. Signor Rostagno examined the manuscript with me, and agreed that the letter erased is quite as likely to have been an α diphthong as an α . M makes such play with his recollection of M and N that one might reasonably have expected him to quote their readings at any rate correctly throughout.

¹ *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, Classical Series, i. 5 (1885). There is a facsimile in Chatelain, *op. cit.*, Planche 97. 1.

² *The Beneventan Script*, p. 354.

it has *ee* (i.e., AE AE = *aiaî*),¹ not 'esse' (!), as M states. Read, 'Post ob. eius cruor in florem inscriptum AI AI cessit.' Again, 'dulcitidine' (p. 685, line 7), 'usuario,' etc. (p. 683, line 10), 'errore' (p. 682, line 12), all look genuine; and 'concubuerint' (p. 689, line 5), as the rhythm shows, is right, the 'quam' in the line before being a corruption of 'quin.' At p. 686, line 1, 'phrygiae' is not, as M says, omitted by κ . The MS. gives 'adite' (i.e. a Dite), not 'adiit,' at p. 684, line 16, and 'ocubitū,' not 'seu bitū' (!), at p. 686, line 12. On the remainder I make three suggestions: At p. 683, line 10, read 'ne infida' ('iphis diu,' κ M) 'aduersus uirum cum infamia reperiretur' (cf. ingratus aduersus deam, p. 689, line 3).²

At p. 688, line 15, the evidence points to 'inpenso amore,' and at p. 684, line 18 f. to 'reuocatam ergo ad inferos Eurudicem' ('ut lucem,' κ ; 'ut ad lucem,' M) 'cum conspiceret, sic dementia stupuisse dicitur,' etc. ('dicitur (?) *per compend.*' is my note of κ 's reading).

After recollating h (= Hauniensis 2008), it is strange that M should have failed to recognise in it the 'Hamburgensis prior' of Heinsius. Yet he cites the MS. sometimes (e.g. at XII. 494 and VI. 119) *twice over*, first as 'h' and then as 'c Hamb,' and sometimes (e.g. at VI. 374 and VII. 246), having missed a point which Heinsius observed, as 'c Hamb' only. This is not workmanlike. Heinsius' 'Hamburgensis alter' is also at Copenhagen (= Hauniensis 2009, saec. xiii.), and M aggravates the confusion by citing this MS. too (e.g. at VII. 151 and XI. 243) as 'c Hamb' only.³ The recollection of

h was worth making, but it is not flawless. There are oversights; e.g. at V. 239 for 'Proetus' h has 'solus' ('om uoc h' is M's comment)—a noteworthy reading, and supported by the *αὐτός* in Planudes, which M suppresses. καὶ γὰρ οὗτος . . . τὴν Ἀκρ. πόλιν αὐτὸς ἐκτίησας, says Planudes: M stops at οὗτος.

M has his inconsistencies. He condemns the Louvain MS. and accepts its evidence against the rest at V. 80. He finds β guilty of a tendency to write s for r, and adopts from it 'incesto' for 'incerto' at IV. 388. He pronounces Planudes almost worthless, and prints large excerpts from his version. He relegates to the *app. crit.* Professor Housman's brilliant correction of the solecism⁴ at VI. 489, and finds a place in the text for his own anæmic suggestion at XI. 180. While for the most part he is intensely conservative—so much so, that e.g. he keeps 'quid facit' at X. 637⁵—at other times he breaks loose, and e.g. ascribes to Ovid (at XV. 154) the error of a MS. dated 1362 A.D.

Many readers will turn first to Book XV. They will find much material⁶ but little satisfaction. The new witnesses of repute, F and τ , between them throw but little fresh light on the dark places in the text. From the latter M introduces at line 479 one novelty, which is also an improvement; but e.g. at 804 F's original reading is erased, and at 838 it has the same corruption as the rest. At 838 M prints Pyllos (= Heinsius and Bentley), and at 804 Aeneaden, first introduced by Heinsius from a codex Vossianus (now in the British Museum), from which M makes yet another alteration at 570. The gloss in α_5 (saec. xiii.-xiv.) suggests, as Mr. Garrod

¹ So also in the text of the poem at X. 215. There again M overlooks the cedillas.

² The corresponding line of the poem (IX. 779) is corrupt. *Punior* is not Ovidian, and Plan. seems here, as elsewhere, to be translating a gloss, οὐκ ἀνείλον ταύτην ἐγώ. The variants suggest something like—

Quod uidet haec lucem, quod non ego conscia plector.

³ Paris. 8001 was identified by Loers (praef. ad init.) with the Codex Berneggerianus Heinsii. Yet (e.g.) at l. 530 M gives us the note 'deo flamma est cc Bernegg. et Par. 8001'—διττοῖν ὀνομάτων μορφή μία! So also at V. 343. There,

however (at the dictates of prudence), the number 8001 is dropped; but see Lemaire. Similarly at l. 69 ϕ is the Liège fragment. Delete from the note either ϕ or 'fig. Leodinese.'

⁴ See Madvig, *Aduersaria Critica*, ii. 83 (the reference is given in the *not. crit.*).

⁵ Merkel is cited as in favour of the reading; but Merkel (p. xxxii) begins by describing the construction thus: 'Manifestus, quantum puto, barbarismus et sine exemplo.'

⁶ There are excerpts and collations of thirty-four MSS., mostly 'notae inferioris.'

points out, that fuller citations of that manuscript's readings might with advantage have been given.

To sum up: I have used the book with increasing disappointment and distrust. A record—let alone an *editio critica*—should be faithful to the facts. Magnus has been overwhelmed by the mere mass of his material—'mole ruit sua.' Enough has been said to show that the book contains far too much slipshod and inaccurate work, together with a certain number of puerile errors. The unwieldy bulk of it and the outrageously large proportion of unimportant matter in the *app. crit.* are bound to tell heavily against it. As long as scholars can still buy for less than a pound the four volumes of Burmann's *Ovidii Opera Omnia*—a better text with better notes, and what is, after all, a better *apparatus criticus*—they will do well to hesitate before they lay out thirty shillings on an edition like this, of the *Metamorphoses* alone, which, in spite of the merits we have indicated, must, I fear, be regarded as

falling very far short of anything like adequate success. One cannot help wishing that Magnus had attempted less. With a narrower scope and greater vigilance he might have come much nearer than he does to that finality to which in the *Praefatio* he admits that he aspired.

A few obvious misprints and errata may be noted: P. xviii, line 14, for 55^v read 56^v. In the *app. crit.* at i. 90 dele h; at I. 268 for ϵ^2 and ϵ read ϵ^2 and ϵ ; at III. 421 for s read ϵ ; at III. 187 dele ϵ ; at IV. 393 for et halant read halant; at X. 408 and at XI. 610 for scripsi read Heinsius (cf. Burmann [1727] *ad loc.*); at IV. 298 in the *not. crit.* for 298/803 read 292/803. Lastly, Professor Housman ought not at this time of day to be credited with the conjectures ascribed to him at I. 632 and at VI. 63, both of which he withdrew—the former twice over and with emphasis—some fourteen years ago in this *Review* (C.R. xiv. 413 and xvi. 443 f.).

D. A. SLATER.

Bedford College, London, N.W.

SHORT NOTICES

Oxyrhynchus Papyri X. Edited with translations and notes by B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. With six plates. London, 1914: Egypt Exploration Fund.

SOME verses of Sappho and Alcaeus, which are the chief treasures of this volume, have already been discussed by Mr. Edmonds in the last volume of this *Review*; but it is proper to give some account of its other contents. Among the theological pieces are some fragments of an uncanonical gospel, apparently a new one. Some of the sayings of Jesus are found in the canon, but in different context and with new elements: one seems to refer to the Greek proverbial saying that an enemy may become a friend, and should be treated accordingly. St. Matthew and St. John are also represented, also St. James's Epistle and Revelations. Three columns contain arguments of Menander's plays, the *Íēpeia* and the beginning

of the Imbrians: a vellum leaf contains new fragments of the *Ἐπιτρέποντες*, and there are other scraps of this author. Several columns of a Chrestomathy, give historical and mythological information. No. 1242 gives part of a new interview between Trajan and rival Greek and Jewish embassies from Alexandria.

A number of classical texts appear: Apollonius Rhodius (with accents), Herodotus (confirming the conjecture of *ὑπερθέμενος* for *ὑποθέμενος* in i. 108), Thucydides (inserting *ἐς* before *ἐπτά* in viii. 10. 3), Plato, Babrius, Achilles Tatius (with material differences of text), Cicero.

The official documents, as usual, contain many new points of interest, but they need technical knowledge to appraise them, and the information is so manifold that it is not easy to summarise. We may mention No. 1264, a Notification of Inviolability, *ἀσυνλία*, whether from duties or taxes or what

does not appear, nor is the reason clear: this is given as *ἐνναιδέα*, which the editors take as a mistake for *ἐνναιδία*. No. 1266, the examination of a lad for membership of the gymnasium, is complete at the end, thus supplementing No. 257. A marriage contract No. 1273 dates from A.D. 260. No. 1275 is the engagement of musicians for a festival. Other contracts and accounts contain miscellaneous matter. The private letters include one from a mother protesting against the alienation of her son (No. 1295), one from a son assuring his sweetest father that he is really working very hard (No. 1296), and one from a son to his mother asking her to send him a number of things (No. 1300). Human nature does not change. S.

Manuel des Études Grecques et Latines
par L. LAURAND. Part I., II.,
pp. 260. Paris: Libraire Auguste
Picard. 1.50 fr. (sewed), or 2 fr.
(boards), each part.

THESE are the first two parts of a manual of information which should be very useful to the general reader as a guide to classical things. They are to be eight parts in all—(i.) Géographie, Histoire, Institutions grecques; (ii.) Littérature grecque; (iii.) Grammaire grecque; (iv.) Géographie, Histoire, Institutions romaines; (v.) Littérature latine; (vi.) Grammaire latine; (vii.) Métrique, Sciences complémentaires; (viii.) Tables méthodiques et alphabétiques—which may be subscribed for at 8 fr. (sewed), or 12 fr. (boards). The idea of the series is to give in easily accessible form all information necessary for the understanding and appreciation of classical antiquity. Each section has a bibliography with guidance for the more advanced study of the subject. The two parts already issued embody the results of quite recent work. The history outline is very good; it is divided into sections, to each of which is affixed a list of contemporary and of later sources. The part on Greek institutions is full of interesting facts, varying from the fashion of wearing the beard at Sparta, details of Greek daily life and education, types of agriculture, etc., down to

descriptions of the Olympic games, oracles, and the Eleusinian mysteries. In fact, the subjects touched upon within these sixty pages present a most varied and animated picture of Greek civilisation. The *literature* volume gives a full analysis of the subject matter of the chief works, followed by literary criticism and appreciation which is often based upon the remarks of Quintilian and other ancient critics. The bibliography of this part is especially useful, and should be invaluable to students working by themselves. Valuable hints abound everywhere. How many of our tutors give their pupils such good advice as this on Dionysius of Halicarnassus? "Aussi ne peut-on se dispenser de le lire si l'on veut étudier à fond les formes de la prose grecque et latine."

R. B. APPLETON.

Euripides and his Age. By GILBERT MURRAY. Pp. 256. Home University Library: Williams and Norgate. 1s. net.

THIS little book is meant for English readers, and we can imagine nothing better calculated to fill them with a desire to learn Greek, if only that they may be able to read the plays of this one author in the original. It is a notable addition to the series and, as might be expected, has interest for the scholar as well as for the general reader. There is a brief, but very interesting, examination of the sources for a life of Euripides, then a full appreciation of the chief plays in chronological order. There is throughout a certain freshness of mind which often brings out very cogently points which we overlook or take for granted; as of the *Hippolytus*, 'The story which might so easily be made ugly or sensual is treated by Euripides with a delicate and austere purity' (p. 87). Especially good are the remarks at the end on the *Deus ex machina* and on the chorus, and the whole book gives a convincing account of the development of Euripides, which, though not controversial, forms an answer to Dr. Verrall's theory, which is only mentioned, incidentally, in the bibliography at the end. Briefly,

the attack on conventional theology is traced to the mysticism rather than to the rationalism of Euripides and it is in this light that we should take the protests against the superstitions, follies and worldliness of his age. Of the *Bacchae* Prof. Murray writes: 'We have in the *Bacchae*—it seems to me impossible to deny it—a heartfelt glorifi-

cation of "Dionysus." No doubt it is Dionysus in some private sense of the poet's own; something opposed to "the world"; some spirit of the wild woods and the sunrise, of inspiration and untrammelled life' (p. 188), but of course he sees in it nothing which may rightly be called a recantation.

R. B. APPLETON.

OBITUARY

By the death of Mr. R. C. Seaton the *Classical Review* has lost one of its most regular contributors, and classical learning a scholar of distinction. Mr. Seaton was born in 1852, educated at Shrewsbury School under Dr. Moss, and Jesus College, Cambridge, of which he was first Scholar and afterwards Fellow, having taken a first-class in the Classical Tripos of 1876. For a few years he practised at the Bar, to which he was called by Lincoln's Inn, then he became a schoolmaster at Dulwich College and afterwards at St. Paul's School, where he remained for over twenty years, and has left behind him a reputation for good scholarship and patient teaching. On retiring from St. Paul's he devoted a large amount of his time to the interests of the Classical Association, in which he was keenly interested: the Association remembers with gratitude the valuable services that he rendered when he held the office of Treasurer.

Mr. Seaton is best known among Classical men as an authority on Apollonius Rhodius, whom he edited in the new Oxford text and in the Loeb series. He had long intended to bring out a large annotated edition of Apollonius, and for this purpose had collected an immense amount of material and made himself most intimately acquainted with his author's use of words. But other interests delayed the completion of the work, and in 1912 he was anticipated by the publication of Mr. Mooney's excellent edition, to which he paid a generous tribute in his review of the book in the *Classical Review* of February, 1914. Evidence of Mr. Seaton's acquaintance with the criticism of Apollonius was given from time to time by notes and articles, not only in the

Classical Review of 1905 (where he reviews Mr. Oswald's dissertation on the use of Prepositions in Apollonius) and of 1911 (where he criticises some rash emendations proposed by Mr. G. Boesch). It is a serious loss to classical scholarship that Mr. Seaton never published the complete result of his researches. In later years he had begun to despair of ever doing so, but had he lived he would have published an annotated edition of Book III.

We have spoken of other interests which prevented the completion of the edition of Apollonius. They were many and various. Mr. Seaton was a sound and learned grammarian, and frequently contributed to the discussion of grammatical points; he was also a skilful compositor, especially of Greek Elegiacs, and many of his versions have appeared in the pages of this *Review*. But his interests were not classical only. He acquired no mean reputation for his work on Napoleon, on whom he may be regarded as an authority. In two volumes he vindicated the character of Sir Hudson Lowe (to whose family papers he had access) against the attacks of certain historians. He also supported the cause of Tariff Reform by a volume entitled *Power and Plenty*.

Finally, in addition to much arduous work for the Classical Association, he took a keen interest in Catholic education, and was on the council of St. Edmund's House, Cambridge, and of the Universities' Catholic Education Board. His loss will be mourned by many who, besides admiring his versatile activity and clarity of thought as a writer, have had the privilege of knowing him as a loyal and warm-hearted friend.

C. G. BOTTING.

NOTES AND NEWS

WE learn that the Belgian quarterly, *Le Muséon*, is to be published shortly at the Cambridge University Press. We have not been informed of its contents: they are chiefly Oriental as a rule, and Professor de la Vallée Poussin, who is now in Cambridge with many of his colleagues, is known as a high authority on Buddhism. But we hope our readers may find something of interest in it for themselves.

We have received the following:

Bacidis uel potius fortasse Sibyllae
Cumanae hocce oraculum Germano-
rum nempe classi exitium denun-
tiantis, itemque Epigramma Caesari
Gulielmo Secundo in maiorem gloriam
monumento inscribendum (ideoque for-
tasse uersiculis Elegiacis conscriptum),
nondum illud quidem in Papyro quo-
quam Oxyrhyncensi repertum, ex
Palimpsesto qui apud se ipsum con-
ditus rebus nuperrime gestis reiectus
est, in lucem edidit, Anglice reddidit,
Germanorum, Wilamowitzii praesertim,
eruditioni commendauit IOHANNES
MACNAUGHTON, in Vniuersitate Re-
giomontana Canadensium Litt. Graeca-
rum et Latinarum Professor Ordinarius.

Αὐτοφόνον τοι Τευτονικοῦ μέγα χρῆμ'
ἀπολείται
ἀγριόδοτος υἱός, εἰς ἅλ' ἐπὶν καταβῇ.
Οὐ γὰρ ἔχει νήχειν τό γε, καὶ σθένει
βλεμέωνον,
ἅλλ' ὀνύχεσσιν ἐοῖς λαιμότομον κατέδν.

Quoth Thomas of Ercildoune or, as it
well mote be, Mother Shipton, in whom
is truly less rhyme but perchance there-
for the more reason:

If e'er he plunge in briny tide,
The Prussian Pig makes suicide,
For why? He hath no skill to swim:
A claw cut throat's the end of him.

A paper was recently read to the
Northumberland and Durham Classical
Association by Mr. M. S. Thompson on
'Methods and Aims of Modern Archaeo-
logy.' Every ancient civilisation (said
the reader) has its own special problems,
and special methods are required to solve
them. The main problems before the ex-
cavator in Greece can be seen by exam-
ining the kind of evidence with which he
has to deal. The public buildings of

Greece, built of stone or marble, have
mostly disappeared through human
agency. Marble is convertible into lime,
and the metal clamps used to join the
stones together were worth removing.
The private buildings, in which mud brick
was largely used, perished rapidly by
natural decay and constantly had to be
rebuilt. They have, however, left behind
layer upon layer of débris, which is most
valuable for the archaeologist. Precious
metals are always hard to find, but the
common metals, bronze and iron, in
Greek soil soon decay. Of all archaeo-
logical evidence pottery is the most
valuable; it is very common, and a
vase once broken lasts for ever in frag-
ments. Modern archaeology begins
with Schliemann, who was the first to
study pottery. Before his time archaeo-
logy was largely a treasure hunt; now its
object is to preserve all possible histor-
ical evidence. Since Schliemann's time
there has been a great advance in the
methods used both in excavation and
in preserving the objects when found.
The paper ended with an account of a
few recent excavations to illustrate rigid
and minute scrutiny to which the sacred
earth of ancient settlements is subjected.

Those who were privileged to hear
Sir Archibald Geikie's address to the
London Branch of the Classical Associa-
tion will be glad to read again what is
practically the same lecture in the cur-
rent number of the *Quarterly Review*.
Those who now read for the first time
the description of the storm on the
Lago di Garda will realise perhaps
more fully than they have ever done
before what a master of English prose
the late President of the Association is.
A discussion followed the lecture, in
which Professor Ramsay maintained
that Catullus, when he settled down at
Sirmio, was very glad to have done with
seafaring; Sir Archibald Geikie held, on
the contrary, that he laid up his old ship
with regret. Members who heard him
will not easily forget the verve with
which he clinched the argument: 'And
I am a yachtsman, and I know.'

We have received, and propose to
notice later, the Proceedings of the
Bombay Classical Association.

VERSION

Come, Peace! not like a mourner
bowed

For honour lost and dear ones wasted,
But proud, to meet a people proud,

With eyes that tell of triumph tasted!

Come, with hand gripping on the hilt,

And step that proves you Victory's
daughter!

Longing for you, our spirits wilt

Like shipwrecked men's on rafts for
water.

Come, while our country feels the lift

Of a great instinct shouting for-
wards,

And knows that freedom's ne'er a gift

That tarries long in hands of cowards!

Come, such as mothers prayed for,
when

They kissed their cross with lips that
quivered,

And bring fair wages for brave men,

A nation saved, a race delivered!

LOWELL.

ἔλθε μὲν, εἰρήνη· σὺ δὲ μὴ κλέος
ὡς ἄρ' ὄλωλεν

μηδὲ μάτην φθιμένους ἔλθ' ὀλοφυρομένη,
ἀλλὰ μέγ' ἐν φρονέουσιν μέγα φρονέουσα

φανείης,

ὦν ἔπαθες δεινὰς οἶα λαβοῦσα δίκας·

ἔλθ' Ἀρέα πνείουσ' ἐγχεσπάλον, ὡς ἐπὶ
νίκῃ,

ἰσχύϊ δ' ἧ σ' ἔτεκεν νῦν ἔτ' ἀγαλλομένη·

πάντες γὰρ δὴ σείο χατίζομεν, ὡς ὅτε
ναῦται

ἐν πόντῳ ὕδατος δηρὸν ἀτεμβόμενοι.

δεῦρ' ἴθι· νῦν γάρ τοι ξυνῇ μάλα πάντες

ἄμ' ὁρμῇ

χωρέομεν, θείην ἐν φρεσὶ θέντες ὅπα,

εἰδότες ὡς οὐ δηρὸν ἐν ἀνδρασιν ἀπτο-

λέμοισιν

ἔμπεδον ἔστ' ἐρατῆς δῶρον ἐλευθερίας·

ἔλθ' οἷός ἐστι παῖσιν γυνήστέργουσα θανούσι

πολλάκις ἀντ' ἀχέων ἐλλιτάνευσε

τυχεῖν,

ἔλθε πόλεως ἀλκὴ σώτειρα τε πατρίδος

αἰης·

καλὸς δὲ ἔστ' ἀνδρῶν μισθὸς ἀγνορίας.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

* * *Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.*

Caesar (de Bello Civili II.) Edited by A. G. Peskett. 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xii + 88. Cambridge: University Press, 1915. Cloth, 4s. 6d.

Cocchia (E.) *Introduzione Storica allo Studio della Letteratura Moderna.* 8" x 5". Pp. viii + 382. Bari: G. Laterza and Figli, 1915. L. 5.

Eitrem (S.) *Opferitus und Voropfer der Griechen und Römer* von S. E. Utgit for H. A. Benneches Fond. 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 7". Pp. 496. Kristiania: Jacob Dybwad, 1915. 15s.

Granger (F.) *Via Romana. A First Latin Course on the Direct Method.* 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5". Pp. x + 132. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1915. Cloth, 1s. 6d. net.

Hammond (B. E.) *Bodies Politic and their Governments.* 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6". Pp. x + 560. Cambridge: University Press, 1915. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

Homer (Odyssey). Books VI., VII. Edited by G. M. Edwards. 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xviii + 72. Cambridge: University Press, 1915. Cloth, 2s.

Leach (A. F.) *The Schools of Medieval England ('The Antiquaries' Books').* With 43 illustrations. 9" x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xv + 349.

London: Methuen and Co., 1915. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

Molinier (S.) *Les 'maisons sacrées' de Délos, au temps de l'indépendance de l'île, 315-166/5 av. J. C.* (Université de Paris, Bibliothèque de la Faculté des Lettres, xxxi.) 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. 108. Paris: F. Alcan, 1915. Fr. 5.

Niccolini (G.) *La Confederazione Achea: Studi Storici.* 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6". Pp. xii + 348. Pavia: Mattei and Co., 1914.

Proceedings of the Bombay Branch of the Classical Association, 1914. 8 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 5 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. 68. Rs. 1.8 net.

Ramsay (G. G.) *The Histories of Tacitus. An English Translation, with Introduction, Frontispiece, Notes, Maps, and Index.* 9" x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. lxxv + 463. London: John Murray, 1915. Cloth, 15s.

Rudberg (Gunnar) *Neutestamentlicher Text und Nomina Sacra, von G. R. Skifter utgifna af K. Humanista Vetenskaps-Samfundet i Uppsala, 17.3.* 9" x 6". Pp. 68. Uppsala: A. B. Akademiska Bokhandeln; Leipzig: O. Hassarowitz.

Seneca. Dialogues X., XI., XII. Edited by J. D. Duff. 7" x 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. lxx + 312. Cambridge: University Press, 1915. Cloth, 4s. net.

ERRATUM.

On p. 11, column 2, line 24 from bottom, *for οὐνεκεν ἀλλήλων read οὐνεκεν Ἑλλήνων.*

λέος

ένη,
υσα

ς·
έπι

ένη·
ότε

.
ντες

,
ττο-

ης·
ούσι
υσε

ίδος

ίης.

for
ished

oth,

elos,
56/5
eque
6½"

tudi
via :

the
68.

tus.
ion,
lex.
ohn

ext
fter
am-
88.
ln ;

by
am-
net.